DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 682 SP 033 003

AUTHOR Stoddart, Trish, Ed.
TITLE Perspectives on Guided Practice. Technical Series 90-1.
INSTITUTION National Center for Research on Teacher Education, East Lansing, MI.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 78p.
AVAILABLE FROM National Center for Research on Teacher Education, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034 ($6.50).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; Beginning Teachers; *Clinical Supervision (of Teachers); Cooperating Teachers; *Educational Principles; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Mentors; Practicums; Student Teachers; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Experienced Teachers; *Reflective Teaching

ABSTRACT

The guiding of novices by experienced teachers is a principal component of the practicum in university-based teacher education programs, alternative routes to teacher certification, and programs of teacher induction and professional development. Novices learn by watching an expert teach and by being in turn observed and then receiving feedback on and support for their own instructional practice. There is, however, little information available about the processes involved in clinical supervision or mentoring. This report uses postobservation conferences between experienced teachers and novice teachers to begin to analyze the guided practicum experience. Six teacher educators discuss three practicum conferences and ask "What is being taught? What is being learned?" These analyses reveal differences in the way experienced teachers interact with novices, how they focus the conference, and how well they engage novices in reflecting on their practice. In the course of the analysis each of the teacher educators explains his/her individual perspectives on the role of guided practice in learning to teach. (Author/IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

NCRTE
Price
$6.50

ED 330082

Technical Series 90-1

Perspectives on Guided Practice

Trish Stoddart, Editor

NCRTE

National
Center for Research
on Teacher Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Kennedy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sponsored by the United States Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Technical Series 90-1

PERSPECTIVES ON GUIDED PRACTICE

Trish Stoddart, Editor

Published by

The National Center for Research on Teacher Education
116 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

November 1990

This work is sponsored in part by the National Center for Research on Teacher Education, College of Education, Michigan State University. The National Center for Research on Teacher Education is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily represent the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or the Department.

National Center for Research on Teacher Education

The National Center for Research on Teacher Education (NCRTE) was founded at Michigan State University in 1985 by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

The NCRTE is committed to improving teacher education through research on its purposes, its character and quality, and its role in teacher learning. NCRTE defines teacher education broadly and includes in its portfolio such diverse approaches as preservice, inservice, and induction programs and alternate routes to teaching.

To further its mission, the NCRTE publishes research reports, issue papers, technical series, conference proceedings, and a newsletter on contemporary issues in teacher education. For more information about the NCRTE or to be placed on its mailing list, please write to the Editor, National Center for Research on Teacher Education, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Director:	Mary M. Kennedy
Associate Directors:	Robert E. Floden G. Williamson McDiarmid
Editor:	Sandra Gross

Many papers published by the NCRTE are based on the Teacher Education and Learning to Teach Study, a single multisite longitudinal study. The researchers who have contributed to this study are listed below:

Marianne Amarel
Deborah Loewenberg Ball
Joyce Cain
Sandra Callis
Barbara Camilleri
Anne Chang
David K. Cohen
Ada Beth Cutler
Sharon Feiman-Nemser
Mary L. Gomez
Samgeun K. Kwon
Magdalene Lampert
Perry Lanier
Glenda Lappan
Sarah McCarthey
James Mead
Susan L. Melnick
Monica Mitchell
Harold Morgan
James Mosenthal
Gary Natriello
Barbara Neufeld
Lynn Paine
Michelle Parker
Richard Prawat
Pamela Schram
Trish Stoddart
M. Teresa Tatto
Sandra Wilcox
Suzanne Wilson
Lauren Young
Kenneth M. Zeichner
Karen K. Zumwalt

Abstract

The guiding of novices by experienced teachers is a principal component of the practicum in university-based teacher education programs, alternative routes to teacher certification, and programs of teacher induction and professional development. The novice learns by watching an expert teach and by being in turn observed and receiving feedback and support on their own instructional practice. There is, however, little information available about the processes involved in clinical supervision or mentoring. This report uses postobservation conferences between experienced teachers and novice teachers to begin to analyze the guided practicum experience. Six teacher educators discuss three practicum conferences and ask "What is being taught? What is being learned?" These analyses reveal differences in the way experienced teachers interact with novices, how they focus the conference and their ability to engage novices in reflecting on their practice. In the course of the analysis each of the teacher educators explain their individual perspectives on the role of guided practice in learning to teach.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I: INTRODUCTION TO THE VOLUME 1
Trish Stoddart, University of Utah

PART II: THREE CONFERENCES BETWEEN CONSULTING TEACHERS AND MENTOR TEACHERS 7

Scenario One: Susan and Sarah 9

Scenario Two: Frank and Frazer 17

Scenario Three: Chad and Rita 23

PART III: COMMENTARIES 31

Experienced Teachers Guiding Novice Teachers 33
Sandra Odell, Western Michigan University

In Search of Examples of "Guided" Practice 43
Dorene D. Ross, University of Florida

Conditions for Learning and Development 51
Allen Black, University of California, Berkeley

When You've Said Reflection, You Haven't Said It All 59
Kenneth M. Zeichner, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Guided Practice: A Case of Eros and Education? 69
Miriam Ben-Peretz, University of Haifa

The Use of Guided Practice in Learning to Teach: From Avoiding to Addressing Teachers' Problems 77
Niels Brouwer, University of Amsterdam

PART I. INTRODUCTION TO THE VOLUME

INTRODUCTION TO THE VOLUME

Trish Stoddart[1]

Throughout this decade it has been argued that teacher education should be restructured and that the bulk of these renewal efforts should go into clinical or field-based programs which focus on developing expert practitioners (Carnegie Task Force on the Teaching Profession, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986). It is also commonly agreed that such practitioners should be "reflective," that is, not only have technical expertise but also have the ability to analyze critically and reflect upon their practice (see for example, Schon, 1987). In these reform efforts great emphasis is placed on the role of experienced teachers as mentors who guide the developing practice of novices. Little is known, however, about the process of learning to teach and the role experienced teachers play in developing reflective practitioners (Feiman-Nemser, 1990). If field-based teacher education programs are to contribute to the development of thoughtful and reflective teachers we must begin to focus our concerns on the quality of these experiences as they are actually implemented in the field and develop a better understanding of the process of guiding practical teaching experience. This monograph presents three diverse examples of conversations between mentors and novices and six perspectives on the merits of these conversations.

Explicit in the title of mentor, advisor, consulting teacher, or master teacher is a presumption of wisdom: Accumulated knowledge that can serve as the basis of sensitive observation, astute commentary, sound advice, and constructive leadership (Little, 1990). Implicit is the expectation that the mentor can make this knowledge accessible to a novice through a process of critical analysis and reflection. Being an effective consulting teacher or mentor is not synonymous with being a good elementary/secondary school teacher but involves a whole new way of thinking about one's own instructional knowledge and skill. To use one's expert knowledge in day-to-day instructional practice is a different matter, intellectually and interpersonally, from articulating that knowledge for the benefit of another's understanding and practice (Yinger, 1987).

Research in cognitive psychology indicates that in-depth personal knowledge of content or skills may actually impede effective mentoring. As individuals develop expertise in a domain they develop a "technical shorthand" of concepts and terminology (Chi, Glaser, and Rees, 1982). This technical shorthand is not easily understood by novices. Effective mentoring requires experienced teachers to unpack, expand, and simplify their personal knowledge. The art of mentoring involves making explicit what is implicitly known. Such understandings are not typically acquired as individuals teach. Most teachers come to experience their work and describe it as intuitive, done without much conscious framing or

---

[1]Trish Stoddart, former senior researcher with the National Center for Research on Teacher Education, is an assistant professor in educational studies at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

reflection (Buchmann, 1989). Mentoring involves a specific kind of expertise that needs to be viewed as distinct professional knowledge and skill and developed in its own right.

Most consulting and mentor teachers, however, receive minimal training for their role; it is assumed that if they are effective instructors of children they will also be good mentors for novice teachers (Little, 1990). In most cases they are left to "invent their roles as they go along" (Hart, 1989, p. 24). It is not surprising, therefore, that they return to what they know. Teachers tend to use the same instructional strategies through which they learned (Lortie, 1975). The research on consulting and mentor teachers reported above indicates that without specialized training most rely on didactic—show and tell—methods in their work with novice teachers which are not supportive of the development of reflective teaching practices.

If consulting and mentor teachers are to engage novices in experimenting, questioning, and reflecting on their practice then they need to develop skill in the process (Fox and Singletary, 1986; Griffin, 1985; Odell, 1986). There is, however, little information available about the processes involved in mentoring or what makes a good mentor. Studies on clinical supervision and mentoring show an absence of any agreed-upon definition of what mentoring entails and little information on the consequences for the people or organizations involved (Bova and Phillips, 1984; Little, 1990).

In order to understand mentoring better it is important to analyze the process that takes place when experienced teachers guide the practice of novices. This monograph uses postobservation conferences between mentor teachers and novices as representative teaching occasions. An integral part of the consulting or mentor teacher's job is to observe novices teaching and then meet with them to discuss their performance. In the sections that follow six teacher educators discuss three practicum conferences and ask "What is being taught?" "What is being learned?" These analyses begin to define effective mentoring and identify the processes involved.

References

Bova, B. M., and Phillips, R. R. (1984). Mentoring as a learning experience for adults. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *35*(3), 16-20.

Buchmann, M. (1989). Teaching knowledge: The lights that teachers live by. In J. Lowyck and C. M. Clark (Eds.), *Teacher thinking and professional action*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Chi, M. T., Glazer, R., and Rees, R. (1982). Expertise in problem solving. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Advances in the psychology of human intelligence* (Vol. 1, pp. 7-75). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 212-223). New York: Macmillan.

Fox, S. M., and Singletary, T. J. (1986). Deductions about supportive induction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *37*(1), 12-15.

Griffin, G. A. (1985). The school as a workplace and the master teacher concept. *Elementary School Journal*, *86*, 1-16.

Hart, A. W. (1989). *Role politics and the redesign of teachers' work*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Utah, Department of Educational Administration, Salt Lake City.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Author.

Little, J. (1990). The "mentor" phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. *Review of research in education* (Vol. 16, pp. 297-351). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Odell, S. J. (1986). Induction support of new teachers: A functional approach. *Journal of Teacher Education*. *37*(1), 26-29.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yinger, R. (1987, April). *By the seat of your pants: An inquiry into improvisation and teaching.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

PART II: THREE CONFERENCES BETWEEN CONSULTING TEACHERS AND MENTOR TEACHERS

SCENARIO ONE: SUSAN AND SARAH

The Incident

This is a third-grade classroom in a school that prides itself on being in the forefront of progressive education. The entire school is involved with Donald Graves's methods of writing. Mathematics is taught in ways that encourage students to understand the concepts and play with the ideas. Children are learning to read from trade books. The student teacher was working with five students who form a reading group. They were sitting on the floor in a cozy area used to hang coats and store kids' lunches and other equipment. The reading group began when the children were sitting on the floor in various upright and reclining positions with their books in their hands. The student teacher said, "Is everyone up to Chapter Five?" Children spoke at once with three of them indicating that they had read beyond Chapter Five. The student teacher then said, "What I want to do is re-read Chapter Five out loud." Children collectively said "oh," which sounded somewhat like a groan of "oh, no." The student then asked a girl, S1, to begin. Each child read several paragraphs until the student teacher interrupted and asked another child to begin. The story was humorous and children laughed at various points.

When the laughter was continuing throughout the reading, the student teacher asked, "What's so funny?" The children responded, "All of the 'of courses'!" (This was a reference to the dialogue and narrative of the text which used "of course" excessively to be humorous. Then, a boy, S2, began reading and had difficulty pronouncing the name of a main character. His giggling increased and the student teacher, after trying to get him to read seriously, sent him back to his seat in the regular classroom. Another child continued reading, but the giggling continued. The student teacher asked them to calm down, but it seemed impossible. One student said, "You gave us this book and it's funny. If you don't want us to read, take the book back." This was said in a straightforward, not hostile manner. The student teacher sent a child to ask S2 to return to the group. He did not return because the cooperating teacher had given him an assignment to complete at his seat. Reading continued until the end of the chapter, when the student teacher sent the children back to their seats with a writing assignment.

The Conference

Susan[2]: teacher candidate in elementary education
Sarah: consulting teacher

Sarah: So how did things go today?

Susan: Um, not that great. I felt like the class wasn't very productive, the groups.

Sarah: Can you talk a little bit about what you expected them to do, because you said they weren't productive.

---

[2]All names in scenarios are pseudonyms.

Susan: Well, I just expected them to have a little bit more self-control, so they could get through the book, the reading. I felt torn, because I want them to be able to laugh at the book.

Sarah: Right.

Susan: 'Cause it's funny. And they have not been enjoying the book.

Sarah: They have not, until this time. So you were glad to see them . . .

Susan: They were just, the issue of losing control. And I felt that Ben was . . . the most out of control.

Sarah: Yeah. Can you talk a little bit about that? Did you notice it coming on, or . . . ?

Susan: He's like that. He's silly.

Sarah: Okay, so you knew that he, if anyone was going to be out of control, it might have been him.

Susan: And he's not a malicious child, or, like . . . Brendan or Ashley misbehave, to just fool around and misbehave, where Ben just misbehaves, but not intentionally. Just, he can't really control himself. He, he's very spacey. And if you, I mean, if you compare Ben to the coded "attention-deficit" kids in our class, he has less attention span.

Sarah: Than they do. So you've noticed this in terms of a pattern that's gone on?

Susan: Not so much in reading group but in class.

Sarah: Okay.

Susan: I mean, [cooperating teacher] and I noticed the other day that he sits across from a coded child, for attention deficit, and that the coded child was putting B1 on attention, you know, helping him get on task a bit.

Sarah: Uh huh. Does that give you any clues about what you might want to do?

Susan: Well, I don't think he, I don't know. I don't think that he has an attention deficit problem. I think that he loves to read so much, that he can't concentrate on anything else. I'm not sure here the other day that he came up to me and said Mrs. L. I think my problem is that I love to read too much. What he does is he reads all the time. He says "The worst part of my day is recess, because I can't read anymore." And the first day, week of school, I had them write those, remember those dream adventures that we did?

Sarah: Yeah.

Susan: Well, his was a page full of books.

Sarah: Uh-huh. Okay.

Susan: So it's not. . . . But what happened is, I felt like I had to have him leave the group because he could not gain, regain control in the group.

Sarah: I noticed that, in the very beginning you said "It's time for you to leave unless you can read, or be serious," were the words that you said. And he said, "I can be serious."

Susan: And then he wasn't.

Sarah: Yeah.

Susan: So I gave him that choice.

Sarah: Right.

Susan: I felt like it wasn't out of line to remove him from the group. But then, consequently what happened is [the cooperating teacher] gave him a really hard assignment.

Sarah: When he was sitting at his seat.

Susan: Yeah.

Sarah: I didn't see that.

Susan: See I didn't give him specifics on what to do. But I wanted him to work on what he was supposed to have done last Tuesday. Because the question was, last Tuesday the writing assignment was write about why you think Jennifer would go, I mean, Elizabeth, would do all these things. And his answer was "Liz shouldn't eat onions everyday, because the taste is too strong and it's not." That's it.

Sarah: And this is what he brought to . . .

Susan: That was his second draft. His first draft was "She's stupid. Onions are yuk." And this child is reading at a seventh-grade level. And writing this stuff. So he's, just doesn't like to do anything but read. So I was, that was already an issue. And [the cooperating teacher] knew about that. So what he did is he gave him a 20-sentence writing assignment, which is a lot for third grade.

Sarah: Yeah. And [the cooperating teacher] gave him that assignment.

Susan: Uh-huh.

Sarah: Okay. He was so upset.

Susan: So he was, he was working on that while we continued with the reading.

Sarah: Uh-huh. And he became upset while he was doing that.

Susan: Well, [the cooperating teacher] said I should go talk to him. I could tell he was about to cry, so I took him out of the room and we talked about it and I told him, I said "I like your humor. I like when you're being expressive, and I'm not mad at you." I said "I'm frustrated with the situation. I want people to learn. And I felt like you were getting in the way. Your laughing was getting in the way of other people's learning. And that's why I had you removed."

Sarah: How did he react to that?

Susan: He understood. And he said, "I know it's a problem. I can't stop myself once I start." And I believe him.

Sarah: Yeah, uh-huh. What clues do you get from this about how you're going to handle this in the future?

Susan: Well I, I would, would think of setting up beforehand, talking to them about my expectations.

Sarah: Okay.

Susan: Reminding them. And maybe setting up some sort of self-monitoring, very informal. Well, we set it up so that, for now, for the next two reading groups, when he was reading, and he was laughing, he couldn't control himself, he would say, "Excuse me, [to another child], will you continue for me?"

Sarah: Oh, really.

Susan: . . . or somebody. And walk around the room once. So that he would regain control and then he'd come back to the group.

Sarah: Uh-huh.

Susan: And then if he wasn't reading, he would just get up without saying anything and walk around until he could control himself.

Sarah: Okay, so when you took him out in the hall, you talked about his behavior, and then you set up with him, that the next time that happens, he will have someone else to read, and walk around the room. . . . Okay. Is there anything else you can tell me about the reading group, and the way it started, and how that related to your expectations of the children's behavior?

Susan: How the reading groups are today or just in general?

Sarah: Today, in general, whatever comes to your mind.

Susan: Hmm. Well, I, I guess I understand, from the beginning, it's only been a session about two weeks or something.

Sarah: Yeah.

Susan: But I felt very aware of each child. And knew that B could get distracted, and was kind of apathetic. That S was a good student, and if she got out of line, you could just call her on it, and she would come back. And, and, I, I knew that A is . . . really difficult to control. And that, that B1 was silly, and that M was sort of negative. So I knew all these personalities going in.

Sarah: Right, yep, okay.

Susan: And I also knew that they were all good readers. I knew that A and S are very good writers. That B tries to get by with as little as possible. And that M is sort of a confused intellectual. I, I like, I knew their personalities well.

Sarah: Right, okay.

Susan: But, we haven't done design, I haven't designed anything yet to meet their personalities, because we've been trying to get into the book.

Sarah: Yes.

Susan: So they, I could get to the point where they liked the book. And A was absent for the first.

Sarah: So this, is this been one of the first sessions she's been in?

Susan: We've had one, two, three, four, five. That's the seventh session. In the second, we only had five before this week, and A missed the first three.

Sarah: Okay.

Susan: And she might have . . .

Sarah: Why do you think "A" started the giggling with the pronunciation of the last name?

Susan: That's what I was trying to find out. That's why I asked. I really didn't know how to handle it. Because I didn't know exactly how it should be pronounced.

Sarah: Now that you can think about it, and you've had a few minutes walking down the hall and so forth, not very long, would you do anything differently, or can you think of ways that you might change the lesson?

Susan: Um . . . I could have them read it, or else, I could have them read silently, but I, they already did that, where we were, or re-reading it.

Sarah: Do you always re-read the chapters out loud?

Susan: No. This was the first time.

Sarah: So this was sort of a new thing.

Susan: Because not everyone had read all of it.

Sarah: Uh-huh. Is that why you decided to read the chapter out loud?

Susan: Uh-huh.

Sarah: Okay.

Susan: And I also wanted to re-read a little bit of what they had read silently. Because they've mostly been reading out loud. And, I wanted everyone to be at the same place.

Sarah: Okay.

Susan: And, um . . . I could have decided beforehand, I didn't think that would be a problem. I didn't think that was, something they would laugh at.

Sarah: Yeah.

Susan: So now I can look at words like that and think of how to deal with that. Or find out how to pronounce it myself . . .

Sarah: That's a good point, yep. Or perhaps preview the lesson with the words in mind, and what they might find difficult.

Susan: They're very good readers.

Sarah: Uh-huh. Oh, they were. I was very impressed with that.

Susan: But they don't cope. Did you notice that?

Sarah: That might be related to the whole issue here. Yeah, I did notice that.

Susan: When they get a difficult word, they say, "oh, whatever."

Sarah: Right.

Susan: Or they put in a different word for it. Or they ask me.

Sarah: I'm trying to figure out why it became such a catching thing. Do you know? 'Cause it actually sort of started with the mispronunciation, and then, people started giggling, and then . . . it went from there.

Susan: Um . . . (pause). Maybe they were real restless. The last three or four times out of seven that we've had reading group we've had people with us.

Sarah: Uh huh. And so, is that it? Is it more visitors? All your colleagues from class have come to observe.

Susan: And they've all seen reading groups.

Sarah: And they've all seen reading groups, okay. Well, so that makes it about, I'm the sixth visitor in a few weeks.

Susan: So it's about 50 percent of the time that we've had visitors.

Sarah: Yeah, yeah.

SCENARIO TWO: FRANK AND FRAZER

The Incident

This conference occurred in Frank's classroom about 20 minutes before school started. Frank had asked his clinical support teacher, Frazer, to meet in his room rather than over breakfast, their usual pattern. Frank wanted Frazer to work on multiplication with a small group. When Frank talked to the district math consultant about different ways to interpret multiplication equations, she told him to ignore the confusing recommendations in the textbook and teach students to read equations the same way whether they were written horizontally or vertically.

Over their last few meetings, Frazer and Frank had been thinking about the discrepancy between the advice of the textbook and the advice of the math consultant. Today, as Frazer worked with Frank's students, he planned to use some rubber bands and small wooden cubes "to help kids get the idea of separating sets of things."

The Conference

Frank: first-year elementary teacher
Frazer: clinical support teacher

Frazer: The way I was doing it with some kids in another third grade was using rubber bands [he pulls out of a paper bag a bunch of rubber bands and small wooden cubes he got from a boardgame called Risk]. I was trying to help them see that these [the rubber bands] define the sets or groups, and here—we're using little wooden Risk cubes from a Risk game. [He sets up three cubes in two rubber bands.]

Frank: That's real clear that's 2 groups of 3.

Frazer: Yeah. Because these define groups or sets, so that the rubber bands really go with the word sets, 2 sets of 3. And I agree with [the district math coordinator] about this, because when the math book teaches it this way, I like the idea of saying "sets of" for the times [symbol] or "groups of" . . .

Frank: All right. You know I've always had a hard time translating this, and [the district math coordinator] and I had a talk the last time she was here about how children take formulae and translate them into their own symbol systems. And I always had a hard time accepting a lot of the math, I don't know what you want to call it, math translations. It wasn't until I started to flip flop things around a little bit to where it made sense to me, that math started to make sense. So, I have a hard time accepting just one set way that the math department wants to do it, at this point. Because, to me, if children want to reverse it or something so it is more easily understandable I think that is fine but I think we should go ahead and start it like this.

Frazer: Well, I was thinking. We're both doing two small groups this morning, why don't you do it in whatever way is most understandable to you. Are you going to do it the way [the math coordinator] suggested in your group?

Frank: Um (pause of about 4 sec.)

Frazer: Or are you going to wait and see?

Frank: Well . . . I haven't really thought it out. I think I would confuse them if I tried to switch gears so I'm going to stick with the way [the math coordinator] said.

Frazer: It sure seems reasonable to me. That math book confused me.

Frank: Me too, because when I look at the math book the way they bring it up, it's flip-flopped. They bring it up differently. If it's written vertically, it wouldn't be 3 groups of 2. The way they break it up, as 2 groups of 3. And that's the way I see it too. It has to do with left brain, right brain things where you look at something visually and the first thing I look at is the first number on *top* becomes the most important number.

Frazer: And that these things [pointing to the Risk pieces], whether they are ice cream cones or cubes, are more important than the idea of grouping.

Frank: I think, yeah. Wait a minute. [He plays with the Risk cubes and sits with a furled brow.] Three. No, I think I reversed that. When it is vertically represented, I think I reverse it. I think I look at it like 2 times 3. As the 3 being the thing that something is happening to . . .

Frazer: Three being the rubber band? You mean when you see it this way [3 x 2] do you see that as the 3 [the number of groups] and this as the 2 [the number in the groups]?

Frank: (pause) No. (pause of about 6 sec.) . . . When it is written that way [horizontally] I see it that way.

Frazer: When it is written this way [vertically], do you see it?

Frank: (pause) And when it's written that way I reverse it again and I see it this way. Isn't that weird?

Frazer: [laugh] It's hopeless!

Frank: I just failed this test! [laughter]

Frazer: [lots of laughter] I don't think you should even consider introducing this to your class! [laugh]

Frank: [seriously] Isn't that funny? I don't know why, but that's how I look at it. I do that all the time.

Frazer: [seriously] I do it with division. I can't get it straight.

Frank: I see why [the math coordinator] is doing this. It makes sense. She is translating it into a verbal thing so that no matter how it is written, you can always say inside your head "3 groups of 2" or "32 groups of 6" or however it is written it is always translated into a verbal thing. But I don't think, when I look at math I don't always immediately translate it into a verbal formula. I translate it into a visual formula. And I'm not sure . . . I want to be able to give that out for kids if they need to do that, see that's the discrepancy I have with it.

Frazer: Are you saying that if kids in here are making sense of it somewhat for themselves . . .

Frank: In their own way . . .

Frazer: In their own way, you don't want to impose that formula [the math coordinator] was talking about on them.

Frank: If it's not natural for them to translate it into a verbal formula.

Frazer: So, what are the implications of that for what we do with them? How will you translate that into your work with them?

Frank: I think what I might do is present it to them like this—I think I might translate it like this, the way [the math coordinator] showed us, but then I might like give them a personal aside and tell them that when I was learning math, [pause; he pretends he is speaking to students] "I want you to be able to do it like this, to translate it into verbal things like this, but also realize that there are other ways to look at it. And if there is an easier way for you to look at it." And I will just maybe give them my own personal story, that I had a hard time with this, and I would reverse it because it was easier for me. And maybe even give them that choice, I don't know. But, when I'm giving a group presentation or even a small group presentation I think I would stick to the way that [the math coordinator] does.

Frazer: So in the large or small group, you would stick with that, but then as you watch a kid and sense they might need something else, then you would, one to one.

Frank: Exactly. Right, right. And if I could see that, if I can see that they are having a hard time with that particular kind of perceiving of the problem, then I would give them that out.

Frazer: That seems real reasonable, because then you would have an overall consistency about it, but the flexibility to do it.

Frank: And obviously these people are doing, I guess this comes from research or something and maybe this is how generally children learn or can translate math formulas at least in multiplication or something, at least in groups or sets. So, maybe that's why they've chosen this because it's generally how they learn and then there are individuals who learn it differently.

Frazer: Yeah, I brought this book and they talk a little about that. The book is *How Children Learn Mathematics* by Richard Coplin. And he's from Florida and it's implications of Piaget's research.

Frank: It looks neat.

Frazer: Yeah, I'll leave it with you. You might want to read page 133, the part on division and multiplication.

Frank: Great. Can I keep that for a couple of days?

Frazer: Sure.

Frank: Okay. I thought we could break kids up. I'll take kids over here at the listening center. I'll take four over there and you'll take four over here at the typing center. [Frank and Frazer were going to work with only one-third of the class.]

Frazer: Fine.

Frank: And we can just talk about, you know, talk a little about multiplication, ask them how they feel about it. They've been working on it for a couple of weeks now, mostly skill drills and things like that. It was hard for me because I knew part of it was part memorization, but I think this is going to help them. We're going to backpeddle a little. This is going to help them visualize what they're actually doing with these multiplication problems.

Frazer: And if they're like the last class I worked with, the third-grade class, there is real variance about how much they know some of the kids are doing.

Frank: Actually, I'm going to give you and me some students that are having a difficult time with that. And even the kids who are getting it and doing well in it still may not be getting this particular representation and they might benefit from that, I don't know, but I think later in the week and later next week I'll get to them in bits and pieces too. But I want to get to the kids who are really having a hard time with it now.

Frazer: That's good.

Frank: Um, (pause) so let's see.

Frazer: Want me to tell you . . .

Frank: Yeah [eagerly]

Frazer: What I'm going to be doing is talking about when we are talking about groups of things. I'm going to say, [he uses the Risk manipulative pieces while he talks to

illustrate what he is doing] "First we'll do the ones, this is one group of none. Zero. Not any. One group of not any."

Frank: Good. Because that was a real hard thing to get and some of the kids that you and I will be working with are having a hard time with that.

Frazer: And that's hard if you have nothing to symbolize this group and you just say, "Here, imagine there's one group of nothing." [laughter] Students say, "Well, where, I don't see anything." Like an empty set.

Frank: Exactly. I was doing this.

Frazer: And then I'm going to give them a piece of paper and write these up [write out the equations to represent what they are doing with the Risk pieces] and I'm going to say, "Okay, now"—Oh, and they'll all have these [the Risk pieces] too.

Frank: Oh, and they'll write these out, too?

Frazer: Yeah. I'm going to have them write it and do one at a time and each one will do it. We got enough cubes so they can each have their own boxes.

Frank: So they'll put the rubber band on the white paper and the cubes and then they'll write it down.

Frazer: Yeah, and maybe right under it. And say, "Okay now we have one set of, or group of, one equals how many?"

Frank: Great.

Frazer: One. So, then I'm just going to take them down . . .

Frank: Sequentially . . .

Frazer: Through nine or ten. Or, I'll see, I might stop at five or so.

Frank: It [the rubber bands] holds five [cubes] pretty well.

Frazer: Or they can stack the pieces. And then if we do that we'll go on to the twos, and put two groups, and then if time permits and some of them are ready and they sense the pattern I'll say, "Okay, now you can just go on, on your own," and I'll watch them and see when they need help. Some of them can go on to three and just write and set up each of the times tables as far as we have time. And whatever you want to do I'll give you half of the manipulatives.

Frank: Yeah, just give me two boxes of one color of cubes.

Frazer: [giving Frank the Risk pieces] Oh yeah, and then they won't fight over color. That's a good idea. What color do you want. Is blue looking good today?

Frank: I would like the blues. Okay. Good. I put out a worksheet that just has some multiplication problems on it on the table but I don't think you're going to need it. I like your idea of just taking it sequentially. And I'm going to use that, too.

Frazer: Well, you're certainly welcome to it. Use any or all of that.

[Conference ends with Frazer reviewing Frank's daily schedule to get an idea of when mathematics will occur.]

SCENARIO THREE: CHAD AND RITA

The Incident

The conference took place in the teacher candidate's classroom immediately following a lesson which the mentor teacher had observed. The teacher candidate had previously received a below average rating on an evaluation by the principal. The particular area of concern was lesson planning and instructional organization. The teacher candidate had not been coming to class well prepared and had difficulty in planning instruction that filled a complete class period. The class is an eighth-grade remedial English class. The teacher candidate divided the class into two groups. Each group was given the same play to read aloud simultaneously. Each student was assigned a part. The teacher candidate read along with one group while the instructional aide read along with the other group. The class consisted of the students reading the play aloud. Students were cooperative.

The Conference

Chad: first-year secondary teacher
Rita: mentor teacher

Rita: Well, I thought it was very interesting. How did you feel about what was happening today. Was this comfortable?

Chad: It was comfortable. It was a Friday and particularly with that group I don't provide a lot of structure on Friday. It's a remedial eighth grade English group. I was very disappointed to find out from my aide that when she gave directions to the second reading group, two students refused to read and one of them is a very bright student.

Rita: Maybe they were a little disappointed that you were not with the group, you know, that it was a little less important perhaps. You can't worry about that—maybe no breakfast, maybe too much breakfast, you know, you don't know what's going to happen.

Chad: But I felt good in my own group with the fact that [name of a student] whose reading ability is the weakest of all 10 members of the group was the one most anxious to read.

Rita: That's great.

Chad: He asked to be the narrator and he also read two parts.

Rita: Yeah, I really think maybe dividing them into groups—as long as you had an aide, this is one of the things that I mentioned here [pointing to notes] you could kind of put one group on its own. If you didn't have an aide, you would probably have to have one student appointed to—okay, now you're in charge of this group and you decide who's going to take which part and you be the narrator so that you could circulate all over the class. Your aide is really helpful but she is very mild, you know, instead of cracking a whip, she's mild. But I don't think there's anything

you can do about that. Well, let's see, I haven't been in your room since you rearranged it and I think that's much more comfortable. It seems to me that you were very comfortable with your short rows and your desk in the corner. . . . Having your podium on the left I think is nice. Even having your table, I was hoping that you would have a smaller table for your overhead.

Chad: That's been promised [laughter].

Rita: But then I thought, you know, it wasn't even bad in this case because you were dividing into two groups and it certainly makes an obvious space there. I thought that was really nice and I also thought it was interesting how you darkened the room. Now I've never done that but you know they walk in and it is calming and there's the focus right there. Then when you're ready to have them get into another activity you turn the lights on. I think that's kind of a nice arrangement. I think maybe I'll do that. I'm going to try the darkening. Now I wasn't there right at the very bell, but they seemed quite calm and they knew what they were supposed to do and they wrote their agendas down and that gave you time to get the roll taken. Then you were moving around watching. When they were ready, then you were ready to go ahead and I think it's so much easier than having to start right out and then hope that you get to the roll later on or having them wait while you obviously aren't doing anything with them. I thought the beginning was very nice. This was a group that has been doing "Winning or Losing"—the unit. Now maybe I missed it but I found the other day when I told the story then I asked them to give me back the same story in their own words, what they remembered was what I said at the beginning not really what they heard on a tape I happened to have of this particular story. I thought now that's something I have to remember that if I even go through it and tell them what they're going to hear, they hear it better. This was a Mark Twain story with a little bit of dialect and they really didn't hear it too well. Now I thought maybe—some of the kids recognized the story, oh yeah, we saw this and they remembered it and of course they recognized the actors from the picture—But, um, uh . . . if there had been a moment maybe just to say, "Now this story ties into this unit, we're talking about winning and is this man losing because he can't read?" I don't know if you really could have tied it in very well but just kind of tell them how we're doing this. Although, if your Friday is a little less structured . . . but I thought they enjoyed it. Did you think so?

Chad: Yes [enthusiastically] I thought they enjoyed it.

Rita: How did you feel about it?

Chad: Yes, I thought they enjoyed it because I was trying to watch and I didn't get any feel yes or no about whether they had personal situations, you know, where there were adult family members who couldn't read. My hunch is there might be—especially the Latino minorities—the kids may be the first literate generation.

Rita: There might be. I would think so. And I could kind of hear in some of their little speeches almost an echo in what a parent might say. They know what their dad

sounds like when he lays down the law or something and here this is kind of coming out in the same way and I thought that was really interesting when they picked up on that.

Chad: The thing that was exciting to me and I keep coming back to it because it was exciting about Josh wanting to do it. He might well be first generation to read.

Rita: That's great.

Chad: Because he doesn't impress me as having been read to. Remembering what my own experience was and having a public library card at age four. I know he doesn't come from that kind of experience, but it's important that somehow he picked up that it's important to be able to read and I thought it took a lot to be able today to do that.

Rita: You know, I thought it, too, particularly with two strangers in the room. You don't always know what the reactions will be.

Chad: Yes. Even Jesus took great delight in correcting him and it was all right. It was all right with Josh.

Rita: Now I was going to say [looking on a sheet she was writing on] here that in that small group it's even easier for them to correct each other and it is so nice to not always be the one to say oh that's wrong, do it this way. If you can get the kids to do it themselves because they like being the one who knows and it's much easier for another kid to take it.

Chad: Yes, Jesus just loves being the one who knows [light laughter].

Rita: Yes, well, you know Jesus much better than me . . . [Looking at her sheet].

Chad: Incidentally, Jesus asked my aide how much she thought I made [in salary]. He said he might want to be a teacher, too.

Rita: That's great. I think once in a while if you influence a child like that, that's a remarkable thing. I think you should get a raise for that. Um, okay, I just have lots of odds and ends I wrote down. Okay, I thought your group size was great because really everyone could read. Usually if only one student reads in the whole group they don't read loudly enough to be heard and other kids complain and they don't understand that you could follow and get the story. I think I'll try that. I have not done that particular thing. Even if you hadn't had an aide, if you would have had two students that you can say, now I'd like you to be in charge of this group. You could tell them, you can be the narrator or you could make the assignments or whatever. I thought it was good that you took the parts of the women. These boys could not do that.

Chad: Oh no, that's very threatening in junior high school.

Rita: So you didn't hassle it you just said, I'll do that and you did it. I think that makes them realize that there's nothing wrong with doing that. . . . I thought every now and then in your group—it was more interesting listening to your group because you would stop them and you would say, what does that mean or you'd explain a little bit more about it—and I imagine that the aide might do that if we hadn't have been there. She would have been more comfortable and a little bit more aggressive maybe. I thought that was a good way to do it. Then I thought, as they were going along, I suspected they would not quite finish and I thought you might even deliberately stop before the last act and ask them to do some writing. You could even ask, How do you think the story will come out, or what is the character going to do through the story?

Chad: That's a good observation. I wish I had given the aide an agreed upon, a designated stopping place.

Rita: Well you just can't tell.

Chad: I had no idea how long it was going to last but I could hear at a couple of points where we were roughly within a speech of each other.

Rita: I heard that too, almost synchronized, it was remarkable.

Chad: Yes, but then when I saw the time, I told her that when you find a convenient place to stop and we will pick it up on Monday. But with my group we stopped at the end of Act 4. Now I don't know where she stopped but I wish in retrospect that I had worked out that logistic ahead of time.

Rita: But that gets down to such fine tuning here.

Chad: And then allow some writing time.

Rita: Yes, you will write on it after. And really, it's awfully hard to know how quickly they would read. The hard words slow them down because they don't just say the word then they have to start at the beginning of the speech and read it again. It really does take a long time. Something else I want to say about writing [looking at her notes]. Well, um, um, I guess even if you just decided, "Okay we will automatically stop before the last act," and then they can even, if you want to work them in pairs, they could do something like writing some dialogues—"what do you think this character would say?"—and here's a chance to get some quotation marks and I know you could work with them and they know all of that. But even, maybe, "write one speech for each of these two characters as they were talking about something." I don't think in a group like that you can expect too much. They're not going to write another act; they're not going to be able to do that I don't think. But they could say, um, the story up until now talks about, or find an adjective as you're going back over it that describes each of the characters. What is an adjective or an action verb that tells about this character? And that's an easy way to get a little bit of grammar in without having to teach grammar. They accept it differently. Sometimes I think, we have to play their game.

Chad: Yes.

Rita: Okay, I thought the fact that this was a play that had characters on the front they recognized that they had seen probably was helpful. They know it's something current. It's not something that comes out of some old book that was written prehistorically. For junior high kids I think they like to see something that's fairly current. [Looking at her notes] Here I say it's different in a fun lesson for Fridays and I think they kind of need a lift at the end of the week, you know, they've worked hard all week. It's kind of nice to be human enough to say, let's do something a little different today and so this is not the kind of lesson that would go on daily by any means but I think it's good for them to know that they can do that too. I think you were uncomfortable at the end because you came to a logical stopping place and then they didn't quite get settled back down and so I was trying to think what you might do. I pulled out—I often keep a page of these puzzles to show the class [shuffling papers in a folder] you would like to look at them. I'm sure you've seen these. [She points to the sheets.]

Chad: No I haven't seen those [he chuckles as he looks at the sheets].

Rita: Okay, well I have a lot of stuff like that. I had a student suggest making some of them into transparencies. I cover up everything but one part of the puzzle and then I ask them, "Don't anybody blurt it out," because it's more fun if everybody waits and you have all these hands waving wildly. [She shows Chad many different puzzle sheets.] That absorbs a little bit of time at the end of the hour and I think they call these activities "sponge activities" [light laughter]. I always feel I have to keep my thumb on them right to the very last minute.

Chad: I was really uncomfortable at the end because I had stopped the story and then I didn't know what to do with eight minutes.

Rita: Yeah, I know and that was really difficult. You really have to think about and I have these puzzles and we'll get these copied off for you so you'll have plenty of these things.

Chad: It would have been helpful if I had planned only to go say half a period and then stop and then write. It would have been easier to stop from a writing point than from the group activity.

Rita: Right.

Chad: That's what I mean by learning in the midst of fire [Chad laughs].

Rita: Yes, what I think is remarkable is how much you've learned in a short time about just dealing with all of these things. It took me 15 years [light laughter]. I even have had everybody take out a sheet of paper and then I desperately would think, what am I going to have them do with the sheet of paper. At one class I was in

somebody said, "Now, you make up a character, just write a description of a character and so that then they have to sort of think on their own."

One day I said, "Take out a sheet of paper and if you had cornflakes for breakfast give yourself one point; if you live in a house that's painted yellow, give yourself one point," and I mean it fills up as much time as you need. Then you say, "Okay, now does anybody have 12 points?" and so on. You can pat them on the hand or something.

They don't really always need rewards it's just the fun of playing the game. I make a collection of things I can do like that. There are some mathematical things where you take your birthday and you multiply it times 4 or your age or something, you know, and then you divide it 3 times with something and you come out with the same number you started with. This is something that gets them all back down to what you want them to be doing. Well, at least they're in their seats. And so even if on your desk you'd have a folder that's just well—I think they still call them sponge activities—and I've got some for you. So if you've got something you can open up and look at instead of having to rack your brain more, but even having some of these things on overheads is quick and easy. I like your use of the overhead. What do you think kids feel about that?

Chad: I think they like it. They are a lot calmer than the time when I used to write things on the board because it makes a more dramatic point of transition.

Rita: I think it's very good. When you want them to get them to sit down and hush up you turn it off, and say well I'm sorry, you missed out.

Chad: That's right. They know they've got to get it down in a hurry because I'm not going to turn it back on. If you didn't get it, you get it from somebody else or when I collect your notebooks I expect to find an agenda for every day.

Rita: I think it's good. It's easier for you because you can have them on three different ones for the different classes and that way you don't have to get it all up on the board, erase or change.

Chad: And I've also thought that I might even have the transparencies in one of my sub folders.

Rita: I think that's a good idea because a class would be structured about the same way. That helps a sub an awful lot. The kids know what's there, that my teacher put it there and it's not a free day. Uh, I think that's about it. [Looking at her notes] I have something in here about prewriting and clustering. If when on Monday you start with the same story, I find they do much better writing if you really take a little time to talk about it. You probably would want after a weekend to kind of refresh their memories about what happened in the story and then what happened and so on. And you may have some absentees.

Chad: Yes. Many students in the school were attending a music concert at UCLA.

Rita: Yeah. In one class there were so many out that we chose not to have the quiz because it just would be so much more difficult for those kids to make up. So it's kind of neat if you can rise to the change in plans. Uh, I'm sure you use clustering, don't you?

Chad: Yes.

Rita: Yes. It's remarkable how much that helps just to get something up on the board. I think the kids like to have a good time and when you are obviously having a good time and you are enjoying it, I think it really makes a difference and I see that. You're glad you're there and you're having a good time. You have such a calm manner with them. You don't get noisy and nervous and jumpy. I think that may be the best thing the kids see all day. At home someone is always yelling at them all the time and here you're polite with them and you listen to them and you show them respect and I think that's just extremely important. I think you're in the right spot. You're going to influence a lot of kids. The last thing I said here [looking at her notes]—you were at the door at bell time. But a lot of the kids are used to not standing up when the bell rings. The teacher says, "Oh, the bell tells me it's time when you're ready and most of them have some classes where they have to wait." That's kind of a nice little moment when you say, "now I'm going to remind you about working, about your book" or just to get them kind of calm again. I sometimes say, "Well, until it gets quiet you're not going to get out of here." Sometimes that will calm them down. Okay, what else?

[Conference begins to close with Chad thanking Rita and the NCRTE researcher for being in the room.]

PART III: COMMENTARIES

EXPERIENCED TEACHERS GUIDING NOVICE TEACHERS

Sandra J. Odell[3]

The scenarios of guided practice that serve as the fodder for this monograph reflect three different approaches used by experienced teachers as they supervise and support novices to teaching in a student teacher or first-year teacher context. A strong presumption of this monograph is that guided practice, such as given in the scenarios, contributes to learning how to teach. It follows that there should be utility in analyzing specific episodes of guided practice so as to identify the particular components of guided practice that are most efficacious in this regard. However, any such analysis is necessarily influenced by one's underlying perspective about what it means to learn to teach.

What Does It Mean to Learn to Teach?

It is difficult to answer the question of "What does it mean to learn to teach?" in the abstract without considering the concrete issues of who is being taught what, by whom, and how. Nevertheless, there do seem to be some fundamental assumptions about learning to teach that elucidate the actual process of learning how to teach. A consideration of these assumptions is presented next, followed by a discussion of the process of learning how to teach.

Assumptions About Learning to Teach

Becoming a teacher is a developmental process. That is to say, teachers progress through a series of stages where their behaviors (Berliner, 1986) and their teaching concerns (Fuller, 1969; Odell, 1986; and Veenman, 1984) become more mature as they gain experience and insight into teaching. This developmental perspective rejects any notion that teachers suddenly emerge as fully competent professionals at the conclusion of their preservice training. Rather, preservice teacher preparation is viewed as but one step in an ongoing process of becoming a teacher that moves from preservice teaching through induction to the teaching profession to inservice and renewal experiences (Burke and Heideman, 1985). It is more than just a cliché to state that learning to teach is a lifelong process.

Learning to teach is also a complex process inasmuch as teaching cannot be readily disaggregated to an ordinal list of technical teaching competencies. While teaching expertise clearly includes being technically able to manage students and to plan learning episodes, it as clearly includes expertise in the application of theory or general principles about teaching,

---

[3]Sandra Odell is associate professor in the College of Education at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

in critical analysis of the teaching process, and in reflecting about teaching (Kennedy, 1987). Consequently, part of the developmental process of learning to teach includes the incorporation of multiple levels of expertise in teaching, including the comprehension of abstract concepts about teaching that transcend the technical activity of teaching per se.

Especially for novices, learning to teach involves interactional processes with their students and with other professional educators. Through the ongoing interaction between the novice teacher and students, the novice gains experience that helps to direct subsequent teaching. Through informal interactions with other teachers, novice teachers increase their perspectives about teaching and learn functional aspects of teaching practice. Still further, formally assigning an experienced teacher to interact with and guide a novice provides the novice teacher with specific opportunities to learn from someone already accomplished in teaching and, importantly, to acquire a conceptual understanding and insight about the process of learning to teach. Indeed, many teacher induction/mentor teacher programs have developed in the last several years that explicitly arrange for experienced teachers to work in these practical and conceptual ways with novice teachers (Brooks, 1987; Huling-Austin, Odell, Ishler, Kay, and Edelfelt, 1989).

A superordinate assumption about learning to teach is that it entails change. Teachers, novice and experienced, hold to specific concepts about teaching. Growth or shifts in these concepts result when questions or anomalies surface for which current concepts are insufficient. An important role for the experienced teacher is to raise questions that help novice teachers to develop and grow—that is, to change—toward more sophistication in their teaching practice. Such change in a novice teacher's concepts about teaching must occur within the novice for the change to become fully incorporated. It is the challenge of the experienced teacher, then, to question, nudge, and guide the novices to the point of originating changes in their concepts about teaching.

How Does One Learn How to Teach?

A significant part of learning how to teach is developing a strong knowledge base. Shulman (1987) offers a description of the categories of knowledge which seems applicable in learning how to become a good teacher. These categories include: content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, curriculum knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of learners and their characteristics, knowledge of educational contexts, and knowledge of educational ends. Darling-Hammond (1989) adds a grounding in professional ethics to the Shulman categories. Beyond the building of appropriate knowledge, one learns to teach by increasing general knowledge about the world through participating in multiple and various life experiences.

Furthermore, one learns how to teach by teaching, and by concomitantly thinking about and interpreting one's teaching. Recently, increased emphasis has been placed on the

process of reflection in learning how to teach (cf. Bullough, 1989; Zeichner and Liston, 1987) and on using the context of teaching as a basis for this learning. Ross (in press) has even provided ideas about using action research, that is actual classroom happenings, as the content for studying the process of teaching.

In addition to developing a knowledge base and reflecting about teaching practice, novice teachers learn how to teach by directly observing effective, experienced models of good teaching. Such observational learning is enhanced when experienced models mediate their teaching practice and "think with" novices about the processes of teaching and learning. Mediation is most effective when the experienced teachers informally explain their practice to novices toward the end of identifying and elucidating the more abstractly complex concepts of teaching for the novice.

In turn, this leads us to the question most directly on point for this monograph; specifically, how does having a novice's teaching practice guided by an experienced teacher contribute to learning how to teach? This question will be addressed in the context of the guided practice scenarios to which we turn next.

Analysis of Guided Practice Scenarios

By way of summary of the above, it has been assumed that learning to teach means affecting a developmental change in the novice teacher through an interactive process that stimulates the new teacher to engender and embrace more sophisticated, complex concepts about the teaching/learning process. How this is accomplished is by the acquisition of knowledge, by teaching, and by engaging in observation and analysis of and reflection on one's own teaching and that of experienced models.

This perspective on what it means to learn to teach provides some touchstones for analyzing the utility and efficacy of experienced teachers guiding novice teachers. While it is asserted with conviction that guided practice can contribute to the novice's learning how to teach, not all guided practice is assumed by any measure to be equal in this regard.

Does an episode of guided practice yield relevant content, provide a perspective on the conceptual aspects of teaching, and set a context for interacting and reflecting about teaching? These are questions that address, respectively, the content of support, the style of support, and the strategy of support used by experienced teachers in guiding the practice of beginning teachers. What follows is an analysis of these features of guided practice as they pertain to the present scenarios.

Content of Guided Practice

Working within a guided practice context, Odell (1986) and Odell, Loughlin, and Ferraro (1987) identified the categories of support actually offered by experienced teachers to novice teachers being inducted into their first year of teaching. These derived categories

of support were deduced to represent the content needs of novice teachers who are learning how to teach with the benefit of guided practice. What teachers learning how to teach seem to need the most is instructional content and support in identifying and collecting resources and materials needed in teaching. A tertiary need of new teachers is to be supported emotionally. Other needs pertain to information regarding the school system, classroom management, and provisioning the teaching environment.

In Scenario One, the supervisor (Sarah) almost exclusively offers emotional support to the novice. She lends an empathetic ear as the student teacher (Susan) talks about the teaching episode that precedes their conversation. Although Susan talks about the instructional processes of reading and writing and about disciplining students, the guidance Sarah offers her is devoid of instructional and classroom management content.

In Scenario Two, the content of support offered to the novice by the experienced teacher is generally instructional. Specifically, Frazer models the importance of analyzing teaching plans and taking inventory of instructional materials before teaching. Frazer also makes suggestions about materials (rubber bands, blocks) and about a book that may be helpful in studying the particular teaching concept further. Importantly, Frazer's guidance is responsive to and isomorphic with the perceived needs of the novice.

Finally, in Scenario Three, Rita offers primarily instructional support by giving information, for example, about grouping students, questioning strategies, instructional timing, sponge activities, and puzzle sheets. However, in contrast to Frazer, whose tendered support is responsive to the content needs of the novice teacher, Rita's support is proscriptive and is provided somewhat independently of the new teacher's needs. To Rita's credit, she also offers some emotional support by describing experiences she has had in teaching and by offering positive feedback about Chad's teaching ("What I think is remarkable is how much you've learned in a short amount of time. It took me fifteen years.")

These scenarios exemplify two adages about the content of support offered during guided practice to novice teachers. First, prior to offering support, the content needs of new teachers need to be determined. Moreover, this needs assessment must be dynamic across time inasmuch as the needs of new teachers change as they gain experience in teaching. Second, the guidance offered should provide content that is responsive to the needs of the novice teacher, whether those needs be instructional or emotional or both.

Needless to say, novice teachers will learn best how to teach when experienced teacher/novice teacher interactions not only fulfill the new teacher's content needs but also help to move the novice teacher to a new level of understanding about how to teach. This latter is less a matter of support content and more a matter of support style and support strategy.

Styles of Guided Practice

Huling-Austin (in press) provides a model of guided practice styles that ranges from the experienced teacher being a responder to the novice to the experienced teacher being an initiator of ideas for the novice. An important aspect of this conceptualization is the degree of responsibility that the experienced teacher assumes for the growth of the new teacher. More specifically, a responder is characterized as an experienced teacher who is willing to guide a novice teacher, but who trusts that the novice teacher will ask for guidance as it is needed. If the novice does not directly ask for guidance, the responder does not assume the responsibility of offering it. On the other end of the continuum, an initiator is an experienced teacher who accepts the responsibility of facilitating the professional growth of the novice teacher by initiating relevant interactions and offering unsolicited suggestions and support.

In Scenario One Sarah, the supervisor, relinquishes all responsibility for directing the conversation with Susan in favor of having the student teacher direct and provide the focus of the conversation. Sarah is obviously a responder. Ordinarily, a responder would deal with needs brought up by the novice by offering suggestions and support related to these needs. In this scenario, Sarah responds only minimally as Susan talks, restricting her comments to endorsing statements like, "Right," "Okay," "Yeah," "Uh-huh." However, even the most adequate responder eschews the many opportunities that arise to add to the knowledge base of the new teacher and to question and guide the novice through reflection toward a more sophisticated level of teacher development.

Frazer and Rita in Scenarios Two and Three clearly adopt the styles of initiators. They both accept the responsibility of enhancing the professional growth of the beginning teacher by interfacing an a manner that goes beyond the extant needs of the beginning teacher. Indeed, the interactions between an initiator and a novice teacher usually are not limited to the specific problems of one particular teaching episode but instead encompass generalized concepts about teaching. Thus, the novice gets the benefit of the expertise and broad perspective of the experienced teacher.

Obviously, adopting the initiator style requires that the guide teacher have substantial teaching expertise, the confidence to share ideas with the novice teacher, and the ability to establish a rapport with the novice teacher that will make the novice receptive to the elaborated concepts regarding teaching being offered. Even at that, however, not all initiators prove to be fully effective guides for novice teachers. They differ particularly with respect to the strategies of guided practice that they employ. This is exemplified well by Frazer and Rita who differ dramatically in the strategies they use to guide Frank and Chad.

Strategies of Guided Practice

Strategies of guided practice are related to the dimension of directiveness in experienced teacher/novice teacher interactions. This directiveness dimension is anchored on one end by nondirectiveness where the novices are free to think for themselves without substantive guidance other than for the experienced teacher to set some limits regarding the topics to be discussed. The nondirective strategy is most appropriate to a responder style of guidance as given by Sarah in Scenario One. Except for one question asked by Sarah, "What clues do you get from this about how you're going to handle this in the future?" She allows Susan to direct the entire interaction. While there is merit in having novice teachers "work through" their teaching problems, the solutions to be arrived at solely through self analysis and reflection are limited by the inexperience of the novice teacher.

As experienced teachers depart from nondirectiveness in guiding novice teachers, they take on increasing directiveness, passing through a midpoint of shared direction to an endpoint of authoritative direction. Any degree of directive strategy can be adopted by an experienced teacher having an initiator style. In the third scenario, Rita approaches adopting a fully authoritative directive strategy.

Rita appears to have an agenda all her own and to afford Chad almost no opportunity to take responsibility for reflecting about his own teaching. Rita's authoritative directiveness seems to reflect an underlying assumption that novice teachers learn how to teach by being told how to teach. While Rita's initiator style causes her to provide Chad with a significant amount of information about teaching, her style is compromised by her directive strategy. Absent is an appreciation that learning how to teach means facilitating conceptual change within the novice through reflection and interaction.

The conversation between Frazer and Frank in Scenario Two exemplifies a mutually directive, interactive strategy of guided practice. Frazer asks questions that set a context to direct Frank to reorganize his thinking and to broaden his own understanding about teaching. For example, Frazer provides directive ideas about teaching and suggests appropriate materials to Frank while concomitantly permitting and encouraging Frank to direct his own thinking about the ideas and materials. There is a clear sense that Frazer's content-laden initiator style, and mutually directive interactive strategy of guidance provides a guided practice episode where the teachers, experienced and novice, are "thinking together" about teaching.

Reprise

Understanding what it means to learn to teach serves nicely to delimit the efficacious components of having an experienced teacher guide the practice of a novice teacher who is learning how to teach. What else needs to be recognized, after all, is that experienced teachers are not by fiat effective guides for novice teachers. Experienced teachers need,

themselves, to conceptualize what it means to guide, and to learn how to guide. This is once again best accomplished through practice in which the experienced teacher is stimulated interactively to learn the concepts of teaching how to teach. Learning how to teach others is truly a lifelong process.

References

Berliner, D. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. *Educational Researcher, 15*(7), 5-13.

Brooks, D. (Ed.). (1987). *Teacher induction: A new beginning.* Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Bullough, R. V. (1989). Teacher education and teacher reflectivity. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(2), 15-20.

Burke, P., and Heideman, R. (Eds.). (1985). *Career-long teacher education.* Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1989). Accountability for professional practice. *Teachers College Record, 91,* 59-80.

Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Education Research Journal, 6,* 207-226.

Huling-Austin, L. (in press). Mentoring is a squishy business. In T. Bey, L. Huling-Austin, R. Kay, and S. Odell, (Eds.), *Mentoring: The hows and whys of supporting teachers.* Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Huling-Austin, L., Odell, S. J., Ishler, P., Kay, R. S., and Edelfelt, R. A. (1989). *Assisting the beginning teacher.* Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Kennedy, M. (1987). Inexact sciences: Professional education and the development of expertise. In E. Rothkopf (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 14, pp. 133-167). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Odell, S. J. (1986). Induction support of new teachers: A functional approach. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 26-29.

Odell, S. J., Loughlin, C. E., and Ferraro, D. P. (1987). Functional approach to identification of new teacher needs in an induction context. *Action in Teacher Education, 8*(4), 51-57.

Ross, D. D. (in press). Action research for preservice teachers: A description of how and why. *Peabody Journal of Education.*

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 1-22.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54,* 143-178.

Zeichner, K., and Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review*, *57*, 23-48.

42

IN SEARCH OF EXAMPLES OF "GUIDED" PRACTICE

Dorene D. Ross[4]

To understand the nature of "guided practice" in these three scenarios, we must first define guided practice. My perspective has been strongly influenced by research and theory about reflective teaching. In this tradition, guided practice should help novice teachers learn how to think about teaching in ways that enable them to make rational and ethical choices and to accept responsibility for those choices (Feiman, 1979; Goodman, 1984; Ross, 1987; Zeichner and Liston, 1987). Guided practice, then, should help the practitioner gain deliberate control over his or her practice through active consideration of the connections between professional actions and purposes, and between theory and practice (Russell, 1989).

This definition suggests four major goals for guided practice: (1) to reveal and evaluate purposes pursued in teaching, (2) to reveal the decisions made about instructional practice, (3) to evaluate decisions made about practice in terms of one's purposes and relevant theory and research,[5] and (4) to stimulate teacher thinking about alternative purposes, strategies, and theoretical frames. As a result of guided practice, teachers should become students of learning asking questions like, "What is learning?" and "How does one foster learning?" and students of children's learning asking questions like, "What intended and unintended learnings have children gained from this experience?" "How does what they learned relate to my purposes?" and "What might I do next time and why?"

I approached the three scenarios looking for examples of "guided practice" in each. As I read, the key word became *guided* because guidance only seemed to occur in the episode between Frazer and Frank. I have used these scenarios, therefore, to distill the essential components of and the nature of effective communication processes during guided practice. Following a description of these components and processes, I will clarify them with a brief analysis of the episodes.

Components of Guided Practice

To help a teacher become more reflective about practice, the supervisor must present a model of professional practice, of how one thinks systematically about teaching. The coaching and modeling strategies associated with cognitive apprenticeship come to mind. Collins, Brown, and Newman (1989) state that an apprentice can acquire complex conceptual

---

[4]Dorene D. Ross is a professor in the Department of Instruction and Curriculum at the University of Florida, Gainesville.

[5]It is important to note that the connections between theory and practice are not perceived as unidirectional: that is, during guided practice, the practitioner should consider how practice informs theory as well as how theory might inform practice.

skills and knowledge by working with a master who models expert performance and coaches the novice toward expert performance. Of particular importance in apprenticeship is the strategy of scaffolding (i.e., providing help by doing the parts of a complex skill that students cannot yet do). In providing guided practice, this model means that the supervisor asks questions, pushes the novice to go as far as he or she can go in teaching performance and in thinking about teaching, and then provides gentle supports to allow the novice to go further. What components of a guided practice episode convey a clear model of deliberative professional practice?

The first component is a *clear focus on the purpose(s) for teaching.* Schon (1987) indicates that the coach of a reflective practitioner must increase the novice's attention to the way problems have been framed and help the novice to search for and experiment with alternative frames as appropriate. This suggests supervisors must help teachers attend to their purposes and their ultimate purpose is children's learning.

A second component is to help the novice *identify and consider alternatives to current practice* (Goodman, 1985; Zeichner and Liston, 1987). To do this, the supervisor must do several things: (1) Help the novice recognize decisions that were made; (2) ask questions that encourage the novice to search for known alternatives; (3) make direct or indirect suggestions by focusing the novice's attention on relevant knowledge (theory, research, and practical knowledge); (4) encourage the novice to play out mentally the consequences of alternatives to tease out the practical implications of ideas and to examine the connections between theory and practice; and (5) push the novice to experiment (i.e., send the novice back into the situation with a commitment to try alternatives).

The third component is to help the novices *connect their actions to the consequences for students and to student actions* (Gitlin, 1981; Zeichner and Liston, 1987). Here the supervisor is attempting to help the novice consider alternative perspectives about classroom interactions, particularly the student perspective. The questions the supervisor poses would include: "What sense did the children seem to be making of the lesson?" "Why did they respond as they did?" "Upon what evidence do you base your conclusions?" The supervisor assists the novice by presenting data from the observation to help the novice recognize alternative explanations and to help him/her judge the adequacy of the evidence used to make decisions. Schon (1983) calls this attending to the "backtalk" from the situation.

Communication Processes

The nature of the "guidance" provided in a conference also is communicated by the communication patterns used. If a conference is to result in meaningful learning, the supervisor and novice must participate collaboratively in the construction of common meaning. Bullough and Gitlin (1989) stress that construction of common meaning requires both parties to be heard. Both must contribute and there must be some equality in terms

of valuing what each has to say and the importance attached to each person's understanding of the situation.

However, guided practice requires more than informed dialogue about teaching. For learning about teaching to become deliberative, there must be a "tickler"; that is, the supervisor must help the novice see beyond his or her initial perceptions by encouraging the novice to consider alternative perspectives and practices. "Guiding" practice means providing this impetus for growth that Schon (1983) would call reframing.

Analysis of the Scenarios

Only one of the scenarios provides an example of "guided" practice using these criteria. The other two include some of the components but lack others that are critical. I would characterize the first scenario as between *practice and personal musings*. In terms of communication processes, the conference is not balanced. The supervisor seems very skilled at getting the student teacher to talk. Sarah asks open questions, helps Susan share her thinking, and reflects back her own understandings. However, Sarah is passive. There is no attempt to help Susan frame or reframe actions in terms of purposes. Because of this, the conference offers little opportunity for student teacher learning.

For example, Sarah asks Susan what students were expected to do but does not probe for clarification when she responds the purpose was to "get through the book." Similarly, no evidence is presented to help Susan reconsider the consequences of her actions. Sarah might have directed Susan's attention to the children's negative response when the lesson was introduced or to the child who commented, "If you don't want us to read, take the book back." In this way Sarah might have guided Susan to evaluate the purposes for the lesson, to consider practices in light of purposes, and to explore alternatives.

In this conference Susan is encouraged to define and solve problems independently. For a skillful teacher with a strong knowledge base, this conference may provide sufficient impetus for professional growth. However, many novices would feel the supervisor "doesn't really help me." Given the comments of many of our student teachers who complain that "All the supervisor does is ask me how *I* felt about the lesson," I suspect this type of conference is not uncommon. In our concern that we not take over *all* the responsibility for a conference, we must exercise caution that we not abdicate our responsibilities as more knowledgeable practitioners.

In the third scenario, the conference between Chad and Rita is similarly unbalanced, but in the opposite direction. This conference I would term, *practice and feedback*. Here the novice is seldom heard. Rita does almost all the talking, assuming her role is to tell, to affirm good practice, and to make suggestions. However, there is no construction of common meaning because Chad's voice is seldom heard and, as importantly, questions of purpose again are not addressed.

Neither party questions the implicit assumption that management considerations control one's selection of activities. Rita not only fails to challenge Chad's thinking about purposes for teaching, but does not seem to think about this in regard to her own teaching. Suggestions for "sponge activities" are offered with no consideration of purpose other than to fill students' time in ways that keep them entertained and under control.

Unlike the first supervisor, Rita clearly sees the provision of feedback about teaching as part of her role. During her observation, it is clear that Rita has made a list of things that Chad has done well and things that might be improved. During the conference, she moves through this list offering positive reinforcement and suggestions of alternatives. Chad will probably respond well to this type of supervision. Novices are insecure and like a mentor who will tell them what to do.

However, the lack of attention to purpose leads me to question what Chad is learning from this conference. I suggest he will learn that he is doing well, that teaching involves the collection of a "bag of tricks," and that one learns to teach by teaching and perhaps by asking advice from one who has "been there." It seems less likely that Chad will learn to attend to the student perspective, to question the purposes for instruction, to explore alternative practices, to rely on a professional knowledge base as a guide to practice, or to evaluate his effectiveness by any criterion other than whether his strategies "work." Thus, this type of supervision seems unlikely to produce deliberative practitioners.

Only in the second scenario with Frank and Frazer do we see an example of *guided practice*. In this conference, the dialogue is more balanced. Both teachers contribute. Both raise questions and here we see questions about practice firmly grounded in teachers' perceptions about the purposes of instruction. As Frank and Frazer struggle to develop strategies to facilitate student learning in mathematics, questions about what students will learn and how differences in teaching strategies might lead to differences in student learning are clearly addressed.

Here, also we see the skillful use of coaching to facilitate growth by the novice. Frazer begins the conference asking open questions and encouraging Frank to think aloud. For example, after Frank has described his understanding of the math processes he will teach and his desire not to "impose" his own way of understanding on children, Frazer pushes him to think through the implications of his ideas for practice. "So, what are the implications of that for what we do with them?"

And Frazer does not hesitate to make suggestions. He comes to the conference with a book for Frank to read and he shares his ideas about how to teach the lesson, "What I'm going to be doing is . . . " Frazer wants Frank to learn to think independently about teaching, but he also recognizes that he is the more experienced practitioner. As such, he feels comfortable making suggestions that are consistent with Frank's goals and that extend Frank's knowledge about practice; that is, he supports Frank by thinking through with him

some of the complex parts of teaching he is not yet able to do (Collins et al., 1989). At the same time, the clear focus on student learning grounds their discussion in their purposes and encourages them to consider the students' perspectives. In this way, Frazer "guides" Frank toward deliberative practice.

In conclusion, it is important to note that the quality of any supervisory episode depends upon the abilities of both parties. Some students are so clearly focused on the technical aspects of teaching that the purposeful interaction seen between Frazer and Frank would be impossible whatever the skills of the supervisor. However, these scenarios also communicate the difficulty of our own tasks as supervisors. Each of these supervisors had some training for the task, yet two were unable to provide "guided" practice (in these scenarios). And as I reflect back over some of the conferences I have had in the past, I recognize some of the flaws that existed in both of these conferences. Attention to the content and communication processes we use in conferences may help us in our efforts to facilitate the development of deliberative practitioners.

47

References

Bullough, R., and Gitlin, A. (1989). Toward educative communities: Teacher education in the quest for the reflective practitioner. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 2*(4).

Collins, A., Brown, J. S., and Newman, S. E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 453-494). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Feiman, S. (1979). Technique and inquiry in teacher education: A curricular case study. *Curriculum Inquiry, 9*, 63-79.

Gitlin, A. (1981). Horizontal evaluation: An approach to student teacher supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education, 32*, (5)47-50.

Goodman, J. (1984). Reflection and teacher education: A case study and theoretical analysis. *Interchange, 15*(3), 9-26.

Goodman, J. (1985). What students learn from early field experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education, 26*(6), 42-48.

Ross, D. D. (1987). *Reflective teaching: Meaning and implications for preservice teacher educators.* Paper presented at the Reflective Inquiry Conference, Houston, Texas.

Russell, T. (1989, March). *The roles of research knowledge and knowing-in-action in teachers' development of professional knowledge.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner.* New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zeichner, K. M., and Liston, D. P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*, 23-48.

CONDITIONS FOR LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Allen Black[6]

As background I refer to theoretical and structural aspects of the Developmental Teacher Education program at the University of California, Berkeley, which I co-direct with Paul Ammon. Because this information is necessarily brief and compacted, I have included references to recent papers that examine some of the issues raised in more detail and are available upon request (Ammon and Hutcheson, 1989; Black, 1989; Kroll and Blain, 1989).[7]

Developmental Teacher Education

The Developmental Teacher Education program, like all *professional* teacher training programs in California, is postbaccalaureate. But rather than the standard fifth-year program, we offer a two-year graduate program that combines a credential for teaching in elementary schools with a master's degree. The extra year and MA degree reflect the time and focus we feel is needed to provide prospective teachers with a strong academic background in human development as well as the time needed for them to work out educational practices that are consistent with developmental theory and research. In our view, a pedagogy based on the application of developmental principles to the teaching-learning process provides an important means to improve that process. Such a pedagogy also provides a unique knowledge base for elementary teaching—a necessary characteristic of a true profession.

One key developmental principle in knowledge acquisition, that has also been adapted by some nonstrictly developmental approaches to learning, is *constructivism*, the principle that knowledge is derived through an individual's efforts at making sense out of his or her own actions on the world, in contrast to copying (or imitating) the successful actions of others—self-invention and discovery learning are similar ideas.

From Piaget's (1977, 1980) particular perspective on knowledge construction, which we favor, certain conditions must be present for progressive change to occur. For example, new knowledge supplants old knowledge through the resolution of contradictions. However, the new knowledge must be within the reach (but beyond the grasp) of the old knowledge because for contradictions to be perceived, they must be selected from possibilities generated

---

[6]Allen Black is director of teacher education at the Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley.

[7]The first three papers were originally included as part of a symposium entitled *Developmental psychology as core knowledge in elementary school pedagogy and teacher education*, A. Black (Organizer), AERA, 1988, New Orleans. The symposium also included commentaries by Marianne Amarel from the National Center for Research on Teacher Education at Michigan State University, and by William Damon, chairman of the Department of Education at Clark University.

by the learner. The primary motivation for change is a matter of resolving internal, not external cognitive conflict. Therefore, merely confronting an individual with an inadequate solution to a problem (e.g., a wrong answer), or offering an alternative that may not be easily assimilable to prior knowledge (e.g., a correct answer), won't do.

An important feature of a two-year program, that relates to developmental constructivism, is the possibility for having more than the standard one or two student teaching placements. We have five placements which vary as to grade level, socioeconomic and ethnic composition of the community served, and extent of involvement in the classroom—from two mornings per week as a participant observer in the beginning of the program, to a two-week, full-time takeover of the classroom as part of a three full-day per week placement during the first semester of the second year.

Five placements, which are less concentrated and more varied than is typical, provide our students with conditions not for imitating a single skilled teacher but for assimilating those aspects of teaching in each setting that make sense to the novice teacher at the time. *Possible* solutions, rather than *correct* solutions, to teaching problems are emphasized. The process of *making sense* also involves coordinating what is seen and what is experienced with the program's developmentally focused coursework—a source of both affirmations and contradictions. Thus, the multiple placements provide an opportunity for continual reflection and self-correction, for example, a recursive, more or less self-regulated, constructive learning cycle.

Given this approach to learning, the protocols offered for our discussion raise the important question of how much direct instruction to provide novice teachers as they work on their own development as a teacher. Based on their interpretations of constructionism, some developmentalists have proposed *learner-centered* pedagogies that minimize the role of the teacher as a direct source of knowledge, which we do not entirely support. In contrast, *teacher- or supervisor-centered* instruction is too directive to fit a constructivist perspective. Since the supervision protocols chosen for our consideration vary from learner-centered (nondirective), to supervisor-centered (directive), they offer an opportunity to suggest an intermediate position while discussing the apparent strengths and weaknesses of the approaches taken in the protocols. Needless to say, my comments are based on an interpretation of protocols presented out of context, not on facts.

Third-Grade Reading Group

The first scenario is interesting to me for two reasons: First, because of the nondirective (clinical) approach Sarah takes to promote reflection and reconceptualization of the lesson on Susan's part; and second, as an example of the potential interrelatedness of classroom management issues and curriculum issues. On the positive side, the nondirective approach keeps the ball in the student teacher's court where it belongs—she

provides most of the words and *all* of the analyses. On the negative side, it seems to me that some opportunities to take an additional step toward resolving important teaching issues are passed over because Susan seemingly is not ready to deal with them.

An example of a side-stepped issue raised by Sarah is why Susan presented her lesson the way she did. Susan is never clear about why she had the students read aloud except to get them all to the same place in the book (a secondary goal), and no reason or goal for the lesson was communicated to the students. Madelyn Hunter among others would be displeased. Although her program is strong on Donald Graves, Susan appears not to have integrated as yet the idea of providing a functional basis for literacy development into her lessons. In addition, possibilities for addressing, in a positive way, the mispronunciation and humorous material issues that arose during the lesson are not explored.

The potential of a nondirective approach for producing change can be seen in the section of the scenario dealing with Ben's self-control problems. Urged to rethink the situation, Susan generates (*constructs*) viable alternatives (*possibilities*) to the total exclusion of the child that can be tried in the future. In many ways this is a curriculum issue too, and in this case, Susan sees the need to come to an understanding with the learner about the purpose of the behavioral curriculum (self-control and noninterference with others), that she does not as yet envision for the reading curriculum itself.

The scenario suggests that Susan is a beginning student teacher and, as is typical, classroom management is her paramount concern. Using this focus as an entry point, Sarah might have broadened it by suggesting that Susan think about bridging the gap between curriculum issues and management issues, for example, by considering curriculum as a management tool. By encouraging Susan to form an analogy with her own proposals for meeting Ben's educational needs, conditions are established for her to construct promising possibilities for introducing a reading lesson as well. She could then return to the management issue at a higher level of integration.

The kind of guided supervision I am suggesting is not so much guided practice as guided thinking. It represents a step up from a strictly clinical interview, which is entirely appropriate when exploring current understandings, but might be improved upon as a means for inducing change.

Elementary Multiplication

In contrast with Scenario One, the more balanced dialogue between supervisor and supervisee found in the second scenario reflects a distinctive component of guided instruction. The more collegial form of supervision models an apparently effective middle ground between nondirective and directive supervision. The scenario also interests me because it highlights a component in learning to teach that seems to show up in mathematics education more clearly than in other areas. The beginning teacher initially makes sense of

the material for himself, as a means for devising a means for his students to make sense of the material. Using manipulatives seems to force this process. Given the relatively meager background in mathematics of most elementary teachers, the value of manipulatives for promoting new understanding for teachers should not be overlooked.

Two related mathematics education issues are explored by the two teachers. One issue is whether or not to teach children a particular concrete meaning for the mathematical expression *a x b*. The second issue is, given the assignment of a concrete meaning to *a x b* (in terms of *sets of* or *groups of*), What rules to use to assign the meaning of *a* versus the meaning of *b*?

The scenario begins with a discussion of the second issue, that is, the mathematical importance of a mathematical *convention* which, in reality, is arbitrary—whether *2 x 3* means 2 sets of 3 or 3 sets of 2. Mathematically, this distinction is only important to establish a consistent terminology, so that the commutative and associative properties of numbers can be demonstrated, that is, that *2 x 3* and *3 x 2* say different things but are numerically equivalent. The fact that both teachers appear to be unclear that this is the heart of the matter, suggests that text publishers should take more responsibility for reminding its users of the purpose for what they are asked to teach. Teachers who are only prepared to follow curriculum designed by others need advanced organizers as much as their students.

Based on his current understanding, Frank (the intern) then goes on to pursue *arbitrariness* further, by suggesting that the particular representations chosen are themselves arbitrary (i.e., sets or groups of). Now, from a developmental perspective, as well as from a mathematical perspective, it can be seen as important to relate multiplication problems to sets and matrix operations. It is not arbitrary from either perspective. Hence Frazer's introduction of Copeland's text.

By providing the manipulatives and Copeland's book, Frazer has established the conditions for Frank to construct a new understanding of both mathematical issues for himself, no matter what the textbook or the math consultant has to say. The text and the manipulatives provide Frank with an important intermediary to interact with, that can provide an understanding that would emerge only slowly through less directed efforts at teaching the mathematical concepts in the classroom (as is necessary in the reading sample). Frazer's success as a clinical support teacher is in establishing a context where Frank is open to assimilating what he reads and to what he *asks* Frazer to demonstrate—a guided practice based on knowledge that can promote a professional independence.

Eighth-Grade Remedial English Class

The third scenario contrasts nicely with the other two examples because it represents the directive end of the degree of supervision continuum. Nonetheless, there is also a similarity in outcomes with Scenario One in that some issues are not addressed directly by

the novice teachers in both protocols. Here, the opportunities for the teacher candidate (Chad) to construct new approaches to the teaching issues raised by his lesson are co-opted by the mentor (Rita). The ratio of supervisor talk to teacher talk is much too high, and the ball (analyses) is almost always in the mentor's court.

The below-average teaching rating received by Chad has led to a situation that illustrates some questionable practices associated with remedial education in general, and hence, questionable modeling for Chad's work with his own remedial class. The questionable practices involve providing learners with correct answers (e.g., number *facts*) or algorithms to be memorized (passively accepted) rather than understood (actively constructed). At some point, when such learnings are required to be combined or built upon, the demands on memory are exceeded, seeming contradictions cannot be integrated, and new, frequently more serious, learning problems appear.

In this scenario, the diagnosed lack of preparedness offers the mentor a vessel to fill with her collected *wisdom of practice*. We learn more about her views on teaching than we learn about Chad's. She is compelled to provide a workable solution to every problem she has identified in her notes, rather than letting the issues be defined, at least initially, by the teacher. Even the interviewer/observer provides Chad with an explanation for the children's initial response to the aide's lesson.

Rita is seemingly very good about affirming Chad's successful teaching efforts, but her comments come across as reinforcement for following the kinds of procedures she might employ. This serves to channel his concerns towards her own, rather than to stimulate new possibilities—perhaps ones that the mentor has not considered, or has forgotten. For example, Chad's spontaneous concerns about his aide's teaching effectiveness are not seriously explored, and his enthusiasm for his apparent success with Josh's desire to read is left almost unexplored, as are *his* ideas about cooperative learning or reciprocal teaching that are implicit in his comments about Jesus' participation.

The symmetry between the lost opportunities in the third-grade and eighth-grade literacy examples suggests that both nondirective, and directive supervision can lead to overlooking opportunities for novice teachers to generate new possibilities for themselves. In my view, overdirectiveness is the more serious problem because it thwarts professional development. Chad is left with doing what he has been told—the well-meaning, well-informed mentor has fostered a dependency that can dampen the new teacher's initiative and the rate at which he acquires the competence to construct his own solutions to future rounds of teaching/learning problems.

Rita's introduction of *sponge activities* is prototypical. Such activities can be very helpful, but by providing a set of prepackaged activities and focusing mostly on the time-filling issue, she closes off possibilities for Chad to construct his own supplementary activities that might be related more closely to his teaching goals than to time filling.

On the other end of the continuum, Susan in the first scenario clearly is being helped toward a self-constructed competence as a teacher. The connection I feel she should make between curriculum and classroom management can be returned to at a subsequent conference. However, progress may be slow, particularly if she is not also provided with a theoretical perspective that facilitates the identification of characteristics of the learner and/or of the subject matter that determine successful and unsuccessful lessons.

As for Frank and Frazer, from the perspective of the Developmental Teacher Education program, they are doing just fine. Frank is being guided to construct his teaching practices based on a combination of knowledge of the subject matter and knowledge of the learner. This knowledge keeps him at the center of the teaching-learning process. Without it, such a position is very difficult to achieve and to maintain, and even more difficult to transmit to others.

My commentary has focused on the application of developmental theory and research to the supervision side of learning to teach. An important issue skirted in the analyses is the extent to which such an application is equally appropriate for beginning teachers engaged in practice teaching as it is for learners in the teachers' classrooms. There is also the educational background of the novices and program characteristics to be considered. I hope these factors will be addressed by other commentators or used as a basis for discussion in the future.

References

Ammon, P., and Hutcheson, B. P. (1989). Promoting the development of teacher's pedagogical conceptions. *Genetic Epistemologist*.

Black, A. (1989). Preparing teachers to apply developmental principles across the curriculum. *Genetic Epistemologist*.

Kroll, L., and Black, A. (1989). Developmental principles and organization of instruction for literacy: Observations of experienced teachers. *Genetic Epistemologist*.

Piaget, J. (1977). *The development of thought: Equilibration of cognitive structures*. New York: Viking. (Original work published 1975).

Piaget, J. (1980). *Experiments in contradiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1974).

WHEN YOU'VE SAID REFLECTION, YOU HAVEN'T SAID IT ALL

Kenneth M. Zeichner[8]

School Experience and Reflective Teaching Practice

It is becoming increasingly clear from recent research on the nature of teacher learning from first-hand experience in schools, that school experience can have a miseducative as well as educative impact on the teacher (Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Zeichner, 1986). This research has shown that student teachers, beginning teachers, and experienced teachers, without the proper guidance, often learn lessons from school experience which are in conflict with the goals of teacher educators and which undermine the ability of the teacher to continue to learn from experience over a career (Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann, 1985; Hoffman and Edwards, 1986).

One positive sign in the current wave of reform in teacher education has been the increased recognition by teacher educators at the preservice, induction, and inservice levels, of the importance of carefully structured and supervised clinical experiences for student teachers and beginning teachers and for educationally oriented supervisory support (rather than merely summative assessment) for teachers throughout their careers. More and more states have made provisions in recent years which are aimed at enhancing the quality of teacher learning from direct experiences in schools. These include the establishment of internships and induction programs for first-year teachers, state department mandates intended to ensure a minimum level of training and preparation for cooperating teachers, supervisors, and mentor teachers, and the establishment of minimum standards for procedures used during the supervisory process (e.g., specifying a minimum number of supervisory visits) (Leatherman, 1988).

Along with this increased attention to the quality of teacher learning during and from firsthand experiences in schools has come the emergence of "the reflective practitioner" as the new zeitgeist in teacher education. In the last decade, concurrent with the rise of research on teacher thinking, "reflective teaching," and closely associated terms like "inquiry-oriented teacher education," "reflection-in-action," and "action research" have become fashionable throughout all segments of the United States teacher education community. It has come to the point now, as Calderhead (1989) has observed, that the full range of beliefs within the teacher education community about teaching, learning, schooling, teacher education, and the social order, have been incorporated into the discourse on "reflective practice." There isn't a teacher educator today who would say that he or she isn't concerned

---

[8]Kenneth M. Zeichner, senior researcher in the NCRTE, is a professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

about preparing teachers who are "reflective" according to some set of criteria. The criteria which have become attached to reflective practice in teacher education are so diverse, however, that it is difficult to know the commitments and assumptions underlying a particular approach aimed at promoting teacher reflection (e.g., clinical supervision) without further analysis of the specific meanings attached to reflection in a particular instance (Liston and Zeichner, in press).

On the one hand, the recent work of teacher educators such as Cruickshank (1987), which has drawn upon Dewey for inspiration, helps us make an important distinction between reflective and routine practice.[9] Similarly, the enormously popular work of Schon (1987), which has challenged the dominant technical rationality in professional education and argued for more attention to promoting artistry in teaching (by encouraging reflection in and on action by teachers), also directs our attention to the preparation of particular kinds of teachers and not others.

These "generic" approaches to reflective teaching lose their heuristic value however, after a point, and begin to hide more than they reveal. For example, after arguing that thoughtful teachers who reflect in and on action are more desirable than thoughtless teachers who are ruled primarily by authority and tradition, both Cruickshank and Schon leave many questions unanswered such as what it is teachers ought to be reflecting about, the kinds of criteria which should come into play during the process, and the degree to which teachers' reflections should involve a critique of the institutional and social contexts in which they work. In some extreme cases where Schon and Cruickshank's work has been applied by others, the impression is given that as long as teachers reflect about something, in some manner, whatever they decide to do is good because they have reflected about it.

The three cases presented in this volume are very good illustrations in my view of the problematic nature of this common assumption among teacher educators today that reflection is necessarily good and that teachers' actions are necessarily better merely because of the fact that they are more deliberate. These scenarios are also good examples of why we need to pay very close attention to the character and quality of teacher reflection in our preparation of those who are to provide "guided practice" to student teachers and teachers. The problems related to teacher learning which are revealed in these cases won't necessarily be solved by prescriptions of more training for the supervisors and mentors involved, since much of training material available today reinforces the problematic focus on means divorced from ends, which is revealed in these cases. In commenting on the specific cases themselves, I will also address how the problems revealed in the cases might be addressed

[9]According to Dewey (1933), reflective action entails "active persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in light of the grounds that support it and the further consequences to which it leads" (p. 9). He distinguishes this from routine action which is guided primarily by tradition and authority.

through the preparation and training of those who are supposed to be guiding the guided practice.

The Cases

One way to think about the quality of teacher supervision that is revealed in these cases is to examine the substance and quality of teacher reflection which is evident in the discourse between the novices and their more experienced mentors. Van Mannen (1977) has outlined three different domains of reflection[10] which can illuminate certain significant aspects of the three cases. First, in technical reflection, the concern is with the efficiency and effectiveness of the means used to attain ends which themselves remain unexamined. Second, in practical reflection, the task is one of explicating and clarifying the assumptions and predispositions underlying the teaching activity and assessing the adequacy of the educational goals toward which the activity leads. Here every action is seen as linked to particular value commitments and the actor considers the worth of competing educational ends as well as how well the particular learning goals that he or she is working toward are achieved by students.

Finally, critical reflection incorporates moral and ethical criteria into the discourse about practical action. Here the major questions are which educational goals, activities, and experiences lead toward forms of life which are mediated by concerns for justice, equity, and concrete fulfillment for everyone, and whether the teaching activity and the contexts in which it is carried out serve important human needs and satisfy important human purposes. For example, critical reflection would extend a concern with the worth of educational ends and with how efficiently they are being accomplished, to a consideration of such things as who is benefiting from the successful accomplishment of those ends and the equity and justice of that situation. From my perspective, learning to teach must involve reflection in all three of these domains, for an experience in guided practice to be considered educative.

Scenario One

In Scenario One we have a very good example of supervision which reinforces an exclusive focus by a student teacher on technical issues. In this case, the task which was given to the children seems to me to be highly problematic. Asking an entire group of children to re-read a story aloud solely because two of the five children had not yet read the story is a justification that clearly warrants some discussion. The conference, however, does

---

[10]Van Mannen (1977) presents these as "levels of reflection." The hierarchical notion of levels conveys the mistaken impression, however, of a developmental framework where technical and practical reflection are eventually transcended and critical reflection prevails. This devalues technical skill and the position of the teacher. The stance taken here is that an educative learning experience during guided practice involves reflection in all three domains (technical, practical, and critical). From this perspective, technical issues are not transcended, but become linked to discussions of the nature of and justification for educational ends and goals.

not involve any serious discussion about the appropriateness of the activity for the children, and how the activity itself and the understandings of the subject that the children brought to the activity, might be related to the giggling that was the focus in the conference. Instead various other factors such as the personalities of children, whether or not they are "attention deficit" kids, and the presence of an outside observer, are all discussed as possible causes of the giggling.

Nowhere in this conference is there discussion of what it is that the children are supposed to be learning from the activity and how well they actually accomplished that learning (practical reflection). The student teacher begins the conference by lamenting the lack of productivity on the part of the children but "productivity" seems to refer merely to whether or not the kids are completing the task in an orderly manner (technical reflection). As is the case with the main activity, the assignment that was given to Ben after his removal from the group seems questionable on educational grounds. Yet, when this issue is discussed by the student teacher and supervisor, the focus is mainly on the child as the problem and not on the task he was given to complete.

Susan, the student teacher, raises a critical issue toward the end of the conference which offers potential for shifting the focus to the core issue of student learning. She comments that the students don't seem to be able to cope with words that are difficult for them. Although this statement reveals a potential problem in the word attack skills that the children may or may not possess, Sarah, the supervisor, quickly shifts the focus away from how the pupils might be helped to figure out words that they don't recognize, to a discussion of the influence of her presence on their behavior.

The supervisor in this particular case does not appear to give any direction to the student teacher; so much so, that it is hard to even classify this case as an instance of "guided practice." Sarah's strategy seems to be to get Susan to talk about and analyze the lesson and then to project into the future about how such a lesson might be modified. There is essentially no reaction by Sarah to any of the specific issues that are raised by Susan. For example, when Susan lists several examples of how she might change the lesson in the future (to deal with the giggling), Sarah accepts all of them with no discussion. In this case Sarah doesn't offer a single observation or suggestion of her own during the conference.

This lack of visible guidance by Sarah, although questionable in this instance, is not the fundamental problem. More direct guidance of Susan by Sarah would not necessarily shift Susan's attention to an analysis of the content of the lesson and its relationship to pupil learning. In fact, much of the material on the market today, both text and multimedia (e.g., Acheson and Gall, 1987; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1988) promotes an exclusive focus on the same kinds of technical issues dealt with in this conference. It seems to me that a reasonable case can be made for either more or less direction on the part of the supervisor depending upon the nature of the discussion which

evolves during the conference. It is conceivable that another student teacher given this same lesson, might, with little direct guidance, focus right away on the lesson and its relationship to pupil learning. When this doesn't happen though, the quality of reflection and teacher learning involved is very narrow and limited without deliberate actions by the teacher educator aimed toward expanding the scope of the supervisory discussion.

Scenario Two

The second scenario is in sharp contrast to the first one because of the focus in the conference on student learning. Here we can find evidence of both technical and practical reflection as Frank and Frazer consider the potential implications of several alternative strategies for teaching students about multiplication equations. Unlike the first case, the concern here seems to be with teaching in a way that will lead to student understanding of the concept involved and not merely with kids doing the task. Technical issues are not neglected but they are linked to the core issue of student learning. Frazer, the clinical support teacher, and Frank, the beginning teacher, discuss several different teaching strategies in relation both to their own abilities to understand the material and that of the children. An action research project of sorts has been set up as two or more different strategies will be tried out (depending upon what Frank eventually decides to do). This could potentially lead to a very interesting postconference where children's reactions to the different approaches are discussed.

There is a spirit of inquiry and experimentation present in this situation that I think is very important to the quality of teacher learning during guided practice (see Hogan, 1983). Frank and Frazer seem to be considering in an open-ended way the reasonableness of the different strategies in terms of how well they will promote understanding for individual pupils. The major issue is not the authority of the one making a suggestion (e.g., the district mathematics consultant), but the potential in a practice for promoting student learning. Frazer confronts Frank with an alternative perspective, one it seems he wouldn't have considered without the supervisor's actions. Importantly, Frank and Frazer will get a chance to assess the wisdom of Frazer's advice when they examine how the children responded during the lesson. Frazer has left a book for Frank to examine, expressed his point of view about teaching students "the idea of separating things," and will demonstrate his own approach with a group of children. He does not attempt to preempt the thinking that Frank is engaged in by supplying him with a "correct" solution. This conference as a whole possesses many of the qualities which I think are important to achieve if we are to promote a high quality of teacher learning during guided practice. The potential for teacher learning in this situation has not yet been realized at this stage, but the experience is headed on the right track.

Scenario Three

The third scenario resembles the first scenario more than the second because of the emphasis in the conference on whether or not the kids do the activity and how positive they feel about doing so (technical reflection). There is very little attention given to what it is kids are learning during the activity and to how the quality of pupil learning can be enhanced (practical reflection). The issue of critical reflection is particularly relevant in this case because of the questionable assumptions which are expressed by both Chad and Rita about the home lives and backgrounds of the students and what they can be expected to learn.

One of the major differences between this scenario and the first is that in this instance Rita, the supervisor, seems to be shifting attention actively away from the issue of student learning. It is not so much a matter of the lack of deliberate actions by Rita to focus attention on student learning, but the almost exclusive technical focus in the direction she does provide. In the very beginning Chad wonders aloud why two students in the aide's group refused to read. Rita's response (e.g., "you can't worry about that") closes off the possibility for examining the relationships between what the kids are being asked to do and how they respond.

Nowhere in this conference is there any substantive discussion of what it is the students are supposed to be learning from the activity. Rita does make the suggestion of having the children write about the characters and predicting endings to the story, comments that this would enable Chad to sneak in some grammar, and discusses the benefits of prewriting activities, but the main emphasis in the discussion on the possibility of having students write seems to be one of efficiency (e.g., coordinating the pace of the two groups, fitting the lesson into the allotted time) and not what it is the students could be learning through the writing beyond the little grammar that would be included. Nowhere, for example, does Rita give us any clues about what she means by the "better writing" which is to follow attention to prewriting activities.

Rita comments throughout the conference on a variety of issues that are not clearly connected with one another except that they all appear in her observation notes. Chad is praised for his new room arrangement and for darkening the room and taking roll at the beginning of the lesson; for the size of the groups that enables all students to get a chance to read and correct one another; and for taking the parts of the women in the play so the boys would not have to do so. Rita also offers Chad many concrete and specific suggestions about how to structure the two groups if an aide had not been available, how to fill in the time with games if the lesson ends before the period is over, and so on. Unlike the first scenario, lack of direction and input from the supervisor is not a problem here.

A most disturbing aspect of this instance of guided practice is the way in which Rita promotes and actively reinforces a deficit orientation toward the home backgrounds and

families of the pupils and very limited expectations about what this group of eighth-grade remedial English students can be expected to accomplish. At various times Rita tells Chad such things as "I don't think in a group like that you can expect too much," and "at home someone is always yelling at them all the time." She also reinforces Chad's comments that the parents of the Latino students are all illiterate, even though it is quite possible that this illiteracy might be limited in some cases to English only.

The perspective which is stressed throughout this entire conference is one of getting the children to adjust to the culture and ways of the school. Nowhere is there any discussion which reveals any appreciation for the cultures which the students bring to the school or of how the school can utilize these perspectives to enhance student learning. Rita actively reinforces the view that the main task is to keep these children busy and happy. Although Rita and Chad seem to be genuinely glad that several of the children such as Josh were interested in reading, they don't seem to want to ask too much of the kids (e.g., expose them to historical material). This deficit-oriented view of the children and their families is a highly questionable one in terms of any reasonable moral and ethical standards.

Conclusion

In each of the scenarios we have seen evidence of supervisors and novices "reflecting" about particular teaching events. If all we are concerned about in guiding "guided practice" is that novices examine their practice and become more deliberate about what they do, then these scenarios can generally be considered examples of successful learning experiences for the beginning teachers. These examples satisfy all of the criteria for reflection which are set forth by the advocates of the so called "generic" frameworks of reflective practice such as Cruickshank (1987).

Once we begin to think beyond promoting teacher reflection in general, however, and about establishing some priorities for the substance and quality of teacher reflection which are linked to an educational and social philosophy, at least two of these cases become highly problematic. Neither Scenario One nor Scenario Three seriously addresses the core issue of student learning. The reflection evident in these cases is almost exclusively technical in character. It seems to me that this obsession with means and procedures to the neglect of student learning cannot be defended, whatever educational and social philosophy one holds. Scenario Two is the only one where the supervisor and novice give any extended attention to what it is the pupils are to be learning and to the relationships between these goals and the activities of the teacher. Furthermore, Scenario Three is an instance where reflection reinforces morally questionable perspectives which will make it more difficult for the particular students in this remedial class to gain access to decent and rewarding lives.

I would guess, judging from the nature of current textbooks and multimedia curriculum materials on instructional supervision, that a common response to these scenarios

from the supervision community would be to focus either on the amount of direction or guidance provided by the supervisors or on the quality of the supervisor-novice relationships evident in the conferences. The definition of "good supervision" according to much of the literature would probably suggest among other things, that the supervisor in Scenario One needs to be more active in directing the student teacher's reflections and that the mentor in Scenario Three needs to be less directive and more sensitive to the thinking of the novice teacher. Each of these cases would also be assessed according to the degree to which the supervisor is supportive of the beginner and sensitive to his or her intentions and concerns.

Although these issues are important, they do not get at the real problems for teacher learning which are revealed in these cases. If we were to think about the ways in which we could work with these supervisors to enhance the quality of the learning which occurs for the novice teachers, we would need to focus their attention beyond the amount of direction and support they provide and beyond the goal of promoting teacher reflection in general to an analysis of what it is they're helping the novices to reflect about, and the kinds of criteria which are being used by both supervisor and novice as standards for judging the quality of teaching actions. It seems to me that a focus on the core issue of student learning (e.g., what are students learning and should they be learning that) is a minimal condition for supervisory encounters. Beyond this, the "domains of reflection" framework offers one way of conceptualizing the variety of issues which need to be addressed in "guided practice" that can be considered truly educative. There are certainly many others. The main task before us right now with respect to the reflective inquiry movement in United States teacher education is to shift the focus away from promoting teacher reflection as an end in itself, toward a situation where there is more direct confrontation between conflicting visions of what the reflection needs to be focused on, the specific quality of thought that is desirable in the reflection, and the purposes which the reflection is to serve. These cases show us very clearly why this is so.

References

Acheson, K. A., and Gall, M. D. (1987). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1988). *Another set of eyes: Techniques for classroom observation.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 5,* 43-51.

Cruickshank, D. (1987). *Reflective teaching.* Preston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think.* Chicago: Henry Regnery.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman and G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman.

Feiman-Nemser, S., and Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 87,* 49-65.

Hoffman, J., and Edwards, S. (1986). *Clinical teacher education.* New York: Random House.

Hogan, P. (1983). The central place of prejudice in the supervision of student teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 9,* 30-45.

Leatherman, C. (1988, April 20). Reforms in education of school teachers face tough new challenges. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* pp. 32, A1, A30-36.

Liston, D., and Zeichner, K. (in press). *Teacher education and the conditions of schooling.* New York: Routledge.

Schon, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Van Mannen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum Inquiry, 6,* 205-228.

Zeichner, K. (1986). The practicum of an occasion for learning to teach. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 14,* 2, 11-27.

GUIDED PRACTICE: A CASE OF EROS AND EDUCATION?

Miriam Ben-Peretz[11]

Guided practice is a cherished and highly evaluated component of pre- and inservice teacher education programs. Pajak and Glickman (1989) state that "repeated cycles of observations and conferences have long been advocated as a way of improving instructional practice in schools" (p. 93). The questions arise how do we perceive this process, and which frame of reference do we adopt in order to interpret and to evaluate it? For the sake of the following analysis of three scenarios of guided practice I propose to adopt Schwab's (1978) conceptions of the role of discussion in education as an appropriate framework for perceiving guided practice.

Guided practice is conceived as part of the education of teachers. One of the cardinal features of this educational process is the discussion carried on by supervisor, or mentor, and student-teacher or novice teacher. In the course of such discussions an exciting outcome is envisaged by advocates of guided practice. The supervisor is expected to assist student-teachers, or novice teachers, to gain professional practical wisdom. How can discussions contribute to the development of such wisdom?

According to Schwab in his essay on *Eros and Education: A Discussion of One Aspect of Discussion* (1978), discussion in itself does not constitute an education. Yet, it is indispensable for the educative process for two reasons: (a) it is a device for promoting understanding of specific kinds of knowledge, and (b) it provides the experience of moving toward such understanding. Schwab goes on to elaborate his conception of the role of discussion in the context of liberal education in colleges. I'll try to show that this conception is valid and relevant as well for guided practice.

Discussions in Education

Schwab (1978) views discussion as a way for engaging Eros in the service of education. He claims that "not only the means, however, but also the ends of liberal education involve the Eros. For the end includes not only knowledge gained but knowledge desired and knowledge sought" (p. 109). Is this not also the anticipated end of guided practice? Prospective and novice teachers are not only expected to gain certain knowledge about the practice of teaching, but to be initiated into a continuous process of seeking to extend and enhance this knowledge.

Schwab views the function of teachers as catalysts and bridges. In Schwab's own words:

---

[11]Miriam Ben-Peretz is a professor in the School of Education at University of Haifa, Israel.

> He is to convert liking and respect for his person into pleasure in practicing what he is and does as a liberally educated person. . . . The Eros, in this last state, is attached to the qualities and capacities in their own right, and not as qualities and capacities of the teacher. (p. 116-117)

In the situation of guided practice the supervisor, or mentor, serves as a model, not necessarily as a model for certain instructional practices, but as a model for educational reflection and for exercising the wisdom of practice. To paraphrase Schwab's words, regarding relation of teachers and student: There is the student-teacher, or novice teacher, with certain potentialities to be developed; there must be a supervisor, or mentor, who appears as competent and as an ally—an emotionally accessible model.

What qualities are necessary for the function of supervisors, or mentors, as emotionally accessible and competent models and allies? How do these qualities contribute to the role of discussion in guided practice? It is suggested herewith that the factors which are deemed appropriate by Schwab for the role of teachers as models and allies are relevant as well to the educational situation of guided practice. An essential factor is the establishment of an interpersonal relationship of mutual liking and respect between teacher and student, or supervisor and supervisee. The relationship has to be one of awareness of the other as an individual, not as a stereotype of a "student-teacher" or a "novice teacher." Another crucial factor of the situation concerns the function of the supervisor as a critic.

Schwab argues that:

> The student wants to be taught, not merely and unqualifiedly 'accepted.' He wants to be accepted as a learner, which means that the teacher must teach. He no more enjoys the transparently false pretense that he is complete than he enjoys attack because he is not complete. He wants neither syrupy friendship nor awful judgment but correction and assistance. These he can accept without anxiety from a person he likes and respects. He likes what is measuredly and discriminatingly kind; he respects what is unpretentiously able and competent. (p. 115)

The supervisor, or mentor, is expected to provide correction and assistance in the complex, and sometimes frightening, process of becoming a teacher. The specific nature of the situation described above requires, according to Schwab, a common task "whose end is admirable and whose difficulty is such as to challenge the capacity of the student and employ the competence of the teacher" (p. 119).

A common task in guided practice may take different forms. The common task may be one of joint lesson planning, joint teaching, or joint analysis of events during a postobservation conference. Joint lesson planning and joint analysis of classroom events,

leading to some tentative solutions of problems, are usually carried out in the frame of a discussion between the supervisor, or mentor, and the student-teacher or novice teacher. Such a discussion may reflect the specific, interpersonal relationship of personal respect and liking. It may also reflect the role of supervisor, or mentor, as critic and teacher.

Schwab suggests three functions of discussions which do more than impart specific learnings. Discussions may also provide learners with the experience of moving toward understanding and with the desire to be actively involved in this process. Schwab calls these the substantive, the exemplary, and the stimulative functions of discussion.

Learning From the Experienced Teacher

Schwab's framework suggests that student-teachers and novice teachers may learn the following from experienced teachers:

- Specific theoretical and practical insights into the teaching-learning situation—the substantive function of discussion
- Modes of reflecting upon the practice of teaching—the exemplary function of discussion
- A desire to be involved in reflection about teaching and in the practice of teaching—the stimulative function of discussion

This learning is considered to occur in a situation which allows for the development of special interpersonal relations between tutor and tutored, via discussions which serve as a vehicle of learning while being engaged in a joint task.

Adopting Schwab's approach we may use the following categories for analyzing episodes of guided practice:

1. Mutual awareness of the participants as individuals
2. Cooperative efforts in a joint real task
3. Modelling of competencies by supervisor or mentor
4. Acceptance of the student-teacher's or novice teacher's efforts linked with measured critique
5. Presence of the three functions of discussion:
    a. The substantive—imparting specific knowledge
    b. The exemplary—providing experience of moving toward understanding

c. The stimulative—inducing the desire to be engaged in reflective activities concerning one's teaching.

We turn now to the analysis of the three scenarios of guided practice based on the categories mentioned above.

Analysis of Scenarios

The first scenario between the supervisor and student-teacher is not balanced as far as the three functions of discussion are concerned. The emphasis seems to be on the stimulative function. Through her probing questions Sarah succeeded in stimulating Susan to reflect upon the classroom events, but the substantive and exemplary functions of the discussion are not emphasized in this conference. Several times Sarah tried to hint at some kinds of specific understanding. For instance, "so you have noticed this in terms of a pattern that is going on"—referring to the notion of seeing classroom events in terms of "patterns."

Another time Sarah suggested a particular instructional technique: "Or perhaps preview the lesson with the words in mind and what they might find difficult." Still, these are only rare cases in a fairly long conference. Mostly Sarah seemed satisfied in echoing Susan's attempts at reflecting about her teaching. From the point of view of the exemplary function of discussion Sarah helped Susan to see how certain questions about students, and about the situation in general, may yield a better understanding of classroom events. Examples of such guiding questions are: "How did he (the student) react to that?" pointing to the need to be sensitive to students' reactions to teachers' words or "Does that give you any clues about what you might want to do?" pointing to the possibility of using certain "clues" in order to understand classrooms in action.

Because the substantive and exemplary functions were not emphasized, or stated explicitly by Sarah, their teaching potential may not have been realized by Susan. Moreover, the problem of lack of self-control of some of the students was not presented as a joint problem for supervisor and student-teacher, and the task of finding a solution was left to Susan alone. In this case Sarah hardly modelled competencies, nor did she provide Susan with some measured critique of her actions. In spite of a sense of some mutual awareness as individuals, mainly noticeable in the last part of the conference when Sarah mentions the difficulty of handling observers in classrooms, the whole scenario conveys an atmosphere of neutrality, or a lack of the supervisor's involvement with the student-teacher in a mutually exciting task.

The second scenario, between a clinical support teacher and a novice teacher, conveys a very different mood. From the beginning of this conference it is clear that mentor and novice teacher share a joint task of planning for teaching multiplication equations. The ensuing discussion balances the substantive, exemplary, and stimulative functions. The

substantive function is expressed in different ways. Frazer demonstrates a certain technique of working with Risk pieces; he also brings a book for Frank to read and suggests which parts of the book would be useful for Frank. Providing Frank with a book fulfills an exemplary as well as substantive function. Searching for appropriate readings is exemplified as a professional mode of searching for solutions to pedagogical problems.

Many other instances in this conference seem to combine the substantive with the exemplary. For instance, Frazer talks about the importance of learners making sense of math in their own way: "You don't want to impose that formula." Here we have a combination of a pedagogical principle with an admonition to be an autonomous teacher who does not necessarily abide with the advice of either textbook or consultant.

Frazer models his competencies as a math teacher in a joint endeavor, accepting Frank's ideas while mentioning some of their weaknesses, for instance, when talking about empty sets. Both teachers seem to be excited and intensively involved in the task. The excitement is stimulating and may lead Frank to further active interest in planning his own teaching. The scenario conveys a strong sense of mutual awareness, liking and respect. This expresses itself, among other things, in the shared laughter, which may be viewed also as a component of the stimulating function of this discussion.

The third scenario takes place between a mentor and a novice teacher. There is no doubt that this postobservation conference takes place in an atmosphere of mutual awareness and liking. Rita, the mentor, is very supportive and offers Chad, the teacher, a large number of positive comments, such as "That's great," "That's a good observation," "I think it's very good."

Rita and Chad seem to share the task of analyzing the observed classroom events in order to learn from this experience. The sense of cooperation expresses itself in several ways. Rita offers to copy puzzle sheets for Chad. She also suggests that she would herself use Chad's lighting arrangements in the classroom. Rita is as active in this discussion as is Chad, and does not hesitate to offer advice and specific bits of information. One may interpret these as constituting the substantive component of the discussion. The problem is that the exemplary function is not emphasized.

Rita's substantive teaching is mainly in the realm of activities to fill up time, "sponge activities," and lacks initiation into modes of reflecting about one's teaching. Rita refers mainly to Chad's "feelings" about the lesson he has just taught. She repeatedly asks Chad how he feels about classroom events, implying that feeling good about one's teaching is the most important criterion for reflection. Moreover, Rita also conveys the impression that one cannot really understand much about classroom interactions: "You can't worry about that—maybe no breakfast, maybe too much breakfast, you know, you don't know what's going to happen," or "I think the kids like to have a good time."

Rita is certainly an approachable model, but in this conference she mainly models techniques to keep students busy. She does convey a sense of caring for children, "I think once in a while you influence a child like that, that's a remarkable thing," but she does not teach Chad modes of moving toward understanding of learners and classrooms. The discussion focuses on the stimulating function, but not on the substantive and exemplary functions. Rita accepts Chad's ideas and does not offer measured critique or new insights into the process of teaching.

Concluding Comments

Various categories were derived from Schwab's approach to Eros and education and to the function of discussion in this context. With the help of these categories we may distinguish between different kinds of guided practice. We obtain insights into the nature of interactions between supervisors, or mentors, and student-teachers, or novice teachers. We learn about the specific knowledge that is imparted, and about modes of reflection which are exemplified in the process. The proposed framework may serve to interpret and evaluate episodes of guided practice. It may be used by supervisors and student-teachers to reflect on their teaching and learning. It is suggested that supervisors and mentors include this framework in their thinking about guided practice.

The framework presented above is considered to be an organic part of the process of learning to teach. A definite role for experience is provided by this framework, balancing these crucial aspects of learning to teach: acquiring specific knowledge, engaging in modes of thinking about the practice of teaching, and last but not least, being motivated to continue with this process of professional growth beyond the phase of guided practice. Being a teacher requires continuous learning which cannot happen without engaging Eros, a passion for professional wisdom. Guided practice is conceived as the situation which may lead to this passion, to the desire and to the required competencies for ongoing professional growth.

References

Pajak, E., and Glickman, C. D. (1989). Informational and controlling language in simulated supervisory conferences. *American Educational Research Journal, 236*, 93-106.

Schwab, J. J. (1978). Eros and education: A discussion of one aspect of discussion. In I. Westbury and N. J. Wilkof (Eds.), *Science, curriculum and liberal education: Selected essays of J. J. Schwab* (pp. 105-132). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

THE USE OF GUIDED PRACTICE IN LEARNING TO TEACH: FROM AVOIDING TO ADDRESSING TEACHERS' PROBLEMS

Niels Brouwer[12]

Introduction

Teachers experience problems in their work, whether they are student teachers, first-year teachers or experienced teachers. This in itself must not be a problem, as long as one conceives of problems constructively, that is, as having a goal, but lacking one or more of the means to approach or achieve it. Life is full of discrepancies between ends and means.

To solve a problem, one must first recognize and formulate it and this, in turn, requires recording, analyzing, and interpreting one's experiences. Without being followed by these intellectual activities, practical experience is likely to produce little else but diffuse memories and seeming certainties. In learning to teach, such outcomes are precisely what guided practice or any form of supervision should prevent. Guided practice should lead teachers not to avoid, but to address their problems. How can it do so?

To illustrate this, I will comment on passages selected from Scenarios Three, One, and Two. I chose this order of treatment, because it will lead from negative to positive examples.

Scenario Three: How Nice Can You Get?

In the third scenario, Rita is showing to the utmost her good will towards Chad. She is flooding him with standard solutions for what she assumes are his teaching problems. However, instead of inquiring whether her assumptions are correct, she stops Chad from interpreting his experiences and formulating his problems. She does this in a number of ways.

To begin with, Rita talks three times as much as Chad (147 against 47 lines of text). She does not set up an agenda with him, but rushes through her notes in no apparent order, as one would grab from the supermarket shelves the items on a shopping list, just before closing time: "Um, okay, I just have lots of odds and ends I wrote down." And: "Okay, what else?"

Rita asks twice: "How did you feel about . . . ?" In both cases, this standard question from nondirective counseling does what it is supposed to do: elicit material from the client. However, Rita does not take advantage of Chad's responses, which signal ambiguities in his teaching experiences. In the first case, he agrees with her suggestion that his lesson "was

---

[12]Niels Brouwer is a teacher and educational psychologist working in teacher education at the University of Amsterdam. His research includes projects on teaching and learning in social studies and the organization and learning effects of preservice teacher education.

comfortable," but immediately goes on to say that he "was very disappointed" by what he sees as a lack of motivation in two pupils. Leaving aside the opportunity to analyze how and why this struck Chad as a problem, Rita begins a monologue about dividing the class into groups and rearranging the room.

The second case mirrors the first. After agreeing politely with Rita's suggestion that the pupils enjoyed the lesson Chad goes on to voice a problem. He is in doubt whether the reading made any personal sense to the pupils and attempts to explain this observation. His sentence "The kids may be the first literate generation" may sound like an awkward echo of some academic theory in danger of fostering cultural imperialism. Nonetheless, for Chad, it is the beginning of formulating a teaching problem. Rita, however, takes his remark as the end of all inquiry: "There might be. I would think so" and launches into speculation about Latino family life.

A third problem of Chad, his "time logistics" goes the same way as the second. It is drowned in praise: "It was remarkable" to which Chad replies, "Yes, but . . . " Why is just about everything that Chad does or says so "nice," so "interesting," so "remarkable," and so "great?" Rita is praising Chad even to the point where she seems to reverse their roles of supervisor and supervisee. Chad is doing things that Rita is ready to copy. Chad "should get a raise." Chad has "learned in a short time" what took Rita "15 years." Chad's manner is "calm" and "polite." His showing respect towards pupils is "extremely important." He is "in the right spot." While it is true that Europeans generally praise their colleagues less so than Americans do, what bothers me is that Rita's lavish compliments probably interfere with Chad's learning.

If anything is being taught or learned in this situation, I think Rita sends three messages to Chad:

1. You and the pupils are wonderful people, regardless of all else
2. Never wonder what school learning should be about
3. Teaching is keeping pupils quiet at whatever activities are enjoyable to them, are 100 percent predetermined, and fit within a period.

Scenario One: Are Dilemmas and Problems Taboo?

Sarah in Scenario Three takes a consistently nondirective stance towards the student teacher. This is apparent from her use of open questions like "Can you talk a little bit about . . . ?" and from her frequent use of the interjections "Okay" (12 times), "Yeah" or "Yep" (11 times), "Uh-huh" (8 times) and "Right" (4 times). The emotion expressed here is mostly, if not always, approval. On average, it is audible once every 1.7 lines of text.

Another type of question recurring in Sarah's language is aimed at "clues about what you might want to do" or "how you're going to handle this in the future" or "ways that you

might change the lesson." In none of the places cited, however, does the question follow from an analysis in any depth of the teaching problem at hand. Rather Sarah cuts short Susan's beginning formulation of the problem, as is especially clear in this abrupt transition:

Susan: I really didn't know how to handle it. Because I didn't know exactly how it should be pronounced.

Sarah: Now that . . . you've had a few minutes walking down the hall . . . would you do anything differently . . . ?

Something seems to be amiss with Sarah's timing of interventions aimed at changes in Susan's future teaching.

My interpretation is that Susan has a need for interpreting her experiences and formulating her problems in teaching, which just cannot be dismissed. How else should one explain what happens towards the end of the exhibit? There, Susan repeats her opinion that the pupils are "very good readers."

Sarah: Uh-huh. Oh, they were. I was very impressed with that.

Susan: But they don't cope. Did you notice that?

After Sarah's vague and almost apologetic answer to this pointed question Susan goes on to formulate her problem, needlessly interrupted by approving interjections from Sarah. Then, instead of going along with Susan's effort, Sarah switches back to Susan's earlier statements about how to react to the pupils' giggling, which Sarah had stopped short in the first place. That definitely knocks Susan off her course: "Um . . . (pause)."

What were Sarah's intentions? That question is hard to answer. Apart from retrieving what teaching goals Susan had in mind I can discern no other rationale in Sarah's interventions than being nondirective for the sake of being nondirective. However, Sarah's stance can hardly have been motivated by humanistic psychology with its tenet that learning wells spontaneously from the individual's innermost resources, for why then interrupt Susan's flow of words so frequently?

Learning, as I see it, is produced by cooperation on a shared problem. In this exhibit, an opportunity for such cooperation was present right from the beginning. Within two sentences, Susan recalled the opposites that created her dilemma: although she "expected them to have a little bit more self-control," she "felt torn, because I want them to be able to laugh at the book." Supervisors can and should make the tension inherent in such dilemmas productive in encouraging learning, rather than shunning away from it like a taboo and approving anything the supervisee says.

Here, it would have been worthwhile to explore and challenge what Susan really meant to say with attributions like "He's silly," "very spacey" or "has less attention span," "was kind of apathetic," "a confused intellectual," and "I knew all these personalities." Why not try and find other ways of looking at pupils, which would portray them less as potential troublemakers than as people with both a sense of humor and a readiness to learn (cf. the end of the incident description)? As it was, Susan was left mostly to her own devices in finding ways to avoid frustration, punishment, and tears:

Susan: Reminding them . . . setting up some sort of . . . self-monitoring, very informal . . .

Sarah: Oh, really.

Scenario Two: Working Together On a Problem

This exhibit differs from the other two in that Frank and Frazer have already recognized and partly formulated the teaching problem to be solved. The exhibit is also different in that Frazer's intentions as a supervisor are far clearer from his actions than can be said of his colleagues above. He attends to Frank's stated interests in learning by bringing materials and encouraging him to analyze instead of avoid the problem at hand. This can be seen, for example, in the way Frazer halts his own speech, as soon as Frank reacts.

From then on, the problem is developed in a dialogue, in which Frazer repeatedly allows Frank the time he needs to think. From stating "So, I have a hard time accepting just one set way that the math department wants to do it," Frank comes to a new understanding of the problem: "I see why . . . " Frazer then makes him recapitulate what he found out: "Are you saying . . . ?" Not until after this has been accomplished, does Frazer move forward to the consequences for action: "So, what are the implications of that for what we do with them?"

Frank then outlines a course of action, whereupon Frazer suggests arguments supporting it. During the rest of the conference, there is time enough left to play through anticipated variations in the lesson as it might unfold. This is a neat problem-solving sequence. As the logical sequence of steps in it is being observed, there is no need for switching back and forth between topics or talking at cross-purposes, which for the participants is both efficient and pleasant.

What is being taught and learned in this situation? First of all, Frank recognizes that both he and the math consultant can be right at the same time. His understanding of the problem has become more differentiated: What is printed in a publication or accepted among colleagues need not automatically be the whole story or the best solution; a textbook's logic may be all right, but the presentation of it to learners may in any specific

classroom have to be altered. Secondly, Frank has exercised the careful planning of a sequence of teacher and pupil actions. Thirdly, he has anticipated that and how an actual lesson may deviate from the lesson plan and what sort of flexible reactions this may require from him as a teacher.

What I find noteworthy in the job Frazer is doing here is that he basically accepts the pedagogical position inherent in the role of teacher or supervisor. That is, he accepts himself as one who has a greater knowledge and command than the supervisee in the kind of work concerned: the teaching of mathematics. Frazer does so without unduly narrowing down the range of choices open to Frank. Frazer's role acceptance does a lot, I guess, to clarify the positions of both people involved and to open up opportunities to learn.

Concluding Remarks

While I was analyzing these transcripts, a definition came to mind which Fritz Perls gave somewhere in his book *Gestalt Therapy Verbatim* (1969): "Contact is the appreciation of difference." What I would like to see happen more often in the process of learning to teach is contact in this sense. In some quarters of teacher education, it sometimes appears to me, humanistic psychology reigns supreme in orchestrating a false show of like minds. When there is no escape from that impression, I would like to be able just to ban phrases like "How do you feel . . . ?" and chimes like "Uh-huh" and "That's great!" and pound the anvil of the need for intellectual effort. One cannot solve existing problems by avoiding them.

Let me close with a few suggestions for how discourse analysis might be put to use in teacher education. Now that cassette recorders have become potentially available to anyone in education, teachers might record, transcribe, and analyze their own lessons and conferences and have them commented upon by colleagues. What they could do is select those passages which intrigue them or stand out according to any other criteria personally interesting, transcribe these passages and analyze them in depth.

Going back to such passages again and again and asking others for comment on one's analyses is, in my experience, a necessity in order to get beneath the surface of the discourse and discover the meanings hidden there. The following three aspects of discourse, I found, are especially rewarding to investigate:

1. Determining the *status* of each utterance in the interactions may reveal a lot about participants' individual meanings, intentions, and agendas and the differences which usually exist between them. Is a remark meant to *structure* the conversation, to *solicit* utterances from others, to *react* voluntarily or to *respond* to what others say or do? (cf. For these admirably parsimonious categories, see Bellack, Kliebard, Hyman, and Smith, 1966, Chapters 4, 5, and 6.)

2. Focussing on *transitions* from one speaker to another may reveal which topics are determining the course of the conversation. This may lead to questions about what is really at stake.

3. Do not overlook phenomena like volume, pauses, pitch, and intonation. They may tell you much about the emotional importance of utterances for the speakers (cf. Coulthard, 1977).

References

Bellack, A. A., Kliebard, H. M., Hyman, R. T., and Smith, F. L. Jr. (1966). *The language of the classroom teacher.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Coulthard, M. (1977). *An introduction to discourse analysis.* London: Longman.

Perls, F. S. (1969). *Gestalt therapy verbatim* (Compiled and ed. by J.O. Stevens). Lafayette, CA: Real People Press.